Of

WITNESSES

Defense! Witnesses	Page
MATSUI, Iwane (resumed)	33882
Questions by the Acting President of the Tribunal, Major-General Myron C. Cramer	33882
Cross (cont'd) by Drigadier Nolan	33883
MORNING RECESS	33907
Cross (cont'd) by Brigadier Nolan	33908
Questions by the Acting President of the Tribunal, Major-General Myron C. Cramer	33917
Redirect by Mr. Logan	33920
(Witness excused and returned to the dock)	33922
YOKOI, Tadao	33967
Direct by Mr. SHIMANOUCHI	33967
Cross by Mr. Tavenner	33970
(Witness excused)	33973
OSHIMA, Hiroshi, (an Accused)	33974
Direct by Mr. Cunningham	33974

Of

EXHIBITS

	No.	Def. No.	Pros.	Description	For Ident	In Evidence
			3499	Magazine entitled "Dai Asia Shugi" January 1941 issue	33898	
2	2396		3499 - A	Excerpt therefrom - Article written by the Accused MATSUI, Iwane (p.2)		33898
			3500	Magazine entitled "Dai Asia Shugi" July 1941 issue	33912	
2	2397		3500-A	Excerpt therefrom - Article written by the Accused MATSUI, Iwane (p.10)		33912
-	2083	3501		Affidavit of TAKAHASI, Michitoshi		33922
2	2084	3502		Affidavit of SUGIURA, Hiroshi		33923
:	2475	3503		Interrogation of Ambassa Ott	dor	33925
				NOON RECESS		33934
2	2542	3504		Affidavit of TANAKA, Shinichi		33958
:	2783	3505		Affidavit of KOMATSU, Mitsuhiko		33960

Of

EXHIBITS

Doc.	Def.	Pros.	Description	For Ident.	In Evidence
		3499	Magazine entitled "Dai Asia Shugi" January 1941 issue	33898	
2396		3499-A	Excerpt therefrom - Article written by the Accused MATSUI, Iwane (p.2)		33898
		3500	Magazine entitled "Dai Asia Shugi" July 1941 issue	33912	
2397		3500-A	Excerpt therefrom - Article written by the Accused MATSUI, Iwane (p.10)		33912
2083	3501		Affidavit of TAKAHASI, Michitoshi		33922
2084	3502		Affidavit of SUGIURA, Hiroshi		33923
2475	3503		Interrogation of Ambassa Ott	dor	33925
			NOON RECESS		33934
2542	3504		Affidavit of TANAKA, Shinichi		33958
2783	3505		Affidavit of KOMATSU, Mitsuhiko		33960

Of

EXHIBITS

(cont'd)

Doc.	Def.	Pros.	Description	For In Ident. Evidence
2662	3506		Affidavit of TATSUMI, Eiichi	33964
			AFTERNOON RECESS	33965
2761	3507		Affidavit of YOKOI,	33967
2862	3508		Affidavit of OSHIMA, Hirosni	33974
2855	3509		Certificate showing Military Attaches and Assistant Military Attaches to Enbassies and Legations were under the Command of the Chief of the Gen Staff in compliance with Military orders concern the organization of Gen Staff Headquarters	neral th

Tuesday, 25 November 1947

2

1

3

4 5

6

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

16

18

20

21

23 24

25

INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL FOR THE FAR EAST Court House of the Tribunal War Ministry Building

The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment,

Appearances:

at 0930.

For the Tribunal, all Members sitting, with the exception of: HONORABLE JUSTICE SIR WILLIAM F. WEBB, Member from the Commonwealth of Australia and HONORABLE JUSTICE R. B. PAL, Member from India, not sitting from 0930 to 1600.

For the Prosecution Section, same as before. For the Defense Section, same as before.

(English to Japanese and Japanese to English interpretation was made by the Language Section, IMTFE.)

L 0 5

f 1 6 e

r 7 8

> 9 10

11 12

13 14

16

17

15

18

20 21

19

23

22

24 25

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session.

IWANE MATSUI, an accused, resumed the stand and testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

ACTING PRESIDENT: Before you proceed, Brigadier, I have a question by a member of the Court.

If you had no power to give orders relative to the maintenance of discipline, please explain the last sentence on page 9 of your affidavit, which I will read to you:

"After entering Nanking on 17 December, I heard about if for the first time, from the Commander of the Kempei unit, and I, at once, ordered every unit to investigate thoroughly and to punish the guilty men."

How do you explain that statement? THE WITNESS: I gathered -- by that passage I meant to say that I gathered together my subordinate Commanders and commanding officers of the various units and expressed to them my desires in regard to the maintenance of discipline and ordered them to take appropriate measures.

1

4 5

6

8

9

11

12

14 15

16

17

18

20

22

23

25

THE MONITOR: Instead of "subordinate Commanders," it should be "subordinate Army Commanders."

ACTING PRESIDENT: But, I thought you testified yesterday that you had no power to give orders.

THE WITNESS: At the time, being Area

Commander, I was given authority and power to unify

and control the strategy -- the joint strategy of

the two Armies.

THE MONITOR: "Area Commander" should be substituted by "Area Army Commander."

THE WITNESS: (Continuing) Therefore, I could not say that the maintenance of military discipline had no connection with military strategy, and therefore, in so far as the two were interconnected, I thought that I did have the power to interfere in matters relating to military discipline, but in the strict legal sense I did not conceive myself as having the power to give specific orders -- orders in detail with regard to the maintenance of military discipline, and this remains my belief to the present day.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Brigadier Nolan.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: If it please the Tribunal.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY BRIGADIER NOLAN (Continued):

5

7 8

9

10

12

13

14

16

17

15

18

21

22

20

23

24

25

Q On page 14 of your affidavit, General MATSUI, you make reference to a meeting in Berlin in 1929. At that time, you had just relinquished your post as Chief of the Second Section of the General Staff Headquarters. Am I right in saying that the basic work of that section was with a collection of information with respect to countries other than China?

A Its duties were general observation.

THE MONITOR: Japanese court reporter.

No correction.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: Did he answer? THE MONITOR: Yes, he did.

Mr. Reporter, will you please repeat the answer as we interpreted it.

(Whereupon, the last answer was read by the official court reporter.)

THE MONITOR: Rather, the witness just merely said, "It is general observation." "Duties" represents our interpretation.

Q And, you say that you made a trip, beginning in January '29. What countries did you visit?

A Passing through French Indo-China, Siam, Burma, and India, I went to Europe, and there, after touring Italy, France, and other countries, passed

through Berlin in April.

2

1

Q And, who defrayed your traveling expenses?

.

A The General Staff.

5

Q Because, in fact, you were a member of the General Staff at the time you made this trip, were you not?

7

6

A I was attached to the General Staff.

8

Q And, you were on duty while you made this tour.

9

11

12

A The duty of an officer attached to the General Staff is that, as far as his position goes, he is in the General Staff, but he has no special

13

14 duties there.

15

The duty -- I suggest that the duty of an officer of the General Staff in the Japanese Army is to be told what he is to do and to do it.

17

19

20

21

22

23

A That is so, but my trip to Europe was authorized by the General Staff because I had just completed a long tour of duty as -- a long tour of duty in the General Staff, and it was partly as Chief of the Second Section, and it was partly for the purpose of recuperation, and also it was to enable me to get a better idea of the world situation.

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

Now, when you visited Italy, France and other European countries I suppose you saw the Military Attaches in those countries?

CROSS

I did.

Then it was not necessary for you to get together with them in Berlin for the purposes of renewing friendship, was it?

It was thought desirable that the Military Attaches to the various missions in Europe should have the opportunity of getting together after some time without seeing each other and therefore the Military Attache in Germany, Major-General OMURA, sent invitations to all the other Military Attaches and they all accepted.

Yes. And they knew that you were coming to Berlin because you had told them when you would arrive.

Yes.

And there were Military Attaches at this meeting from Great Britain, Germany, France, Poland, Russia, Austria, Turkey and Italy; is that correct?

Α Yes.

And the accused HASHIMOTO was there, being the Military Attache in Turkey at that time.

A Yes.

Was the accused SUZUKI there?

A It was not the defendant SUZUKI. The Military Attache in Poland was a certain Colonel SUZUKI, but it was a different SUZUKI.

Q Yes, I understand.

Now, at this meeting such matters as sabotage and espionage against Russia were discussed, were they not?

A No, no such things were discussed. Each representative told of the situation in the country in which he was stationed.

Q Yes. And what else was done at the meeting?

A After talking all day on various topics we went to a restaurant for the evening and had a merry time. That is about all.

Q In exhibit 733-A, being an excerpt from your interrogation held on the 25th of April, 1946, you were shown a copy of exhibit 732-A. And exhibit 732-A is entitled "Items Concerning the U.S.S.R. Presented at the Conference of Japanese Military Attaches in Europe." Among the items mentioned in the document are sabotage and espionage, and you made this statement in your interrogation: "Having read the document shown to me, I have come to the conclusion that the notes were made by one of the persons who were present at the Conference and apparently reflect correctly

the contents of some of the questions which were considered at the Conference."

Do you wish to make any change in that statement, because I observe in your affidavit you refer to exhibit No. 733?

A I do not know what kind of document 733 is, but during the course of my interrogations by the Soviet authorities they presented me with a document which was quite different from the one you described.

Q Well, I will present it to you again, if I may. It is exhibit 732-A.

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

Q Now, General MATSUI, that is not quite different from the document I have just described, because it is the same document. Will you please look at it?

A It is quite different. It is a completely different document. The document which was shown to me had on page 1 the names of the people, who and who and who, and then the various items were itemized. And it was a very short document.

Q Well, the various items are itemized here and perhaps you will look at them and tell me whether they represent the matters discussed at the meeting

2

3

1

4 5

6

7

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

20 21

22

23

24

in Berlin?

A We never specially discussed such problems as written down here. First, to begin with, the very title, "Items concerning the U.S.S.R., presented at the Conference of Japanese Military Attaches in Europe" is sheer nonsense.

Q Well, the accused HASHIMOTO at page 28,839 of the record stated that at this meeting to which we are referring the topic of sabotage and espionage against Russia came up. Is he wrong about that?

A I do recall, of course, that since Colonel HASHIMOTO was Military Attache in Turkey he spoke of the question of intelligence work vis-a-vis Russia. Of course, I do not recall the contents of his talk in detail at the present moment.

Q Did it deal with the question of sending White Russian spies into the U.S.S.R.?

A I do recall that he spoke of utilizing the White Russians who were in Turkey, but I do not recall ever having discussed the question of specially sending White Russians into Russia surreptitiously.

K a 1 p 2 e a 3 u 4 & 5 K 6 n a 7 p 8

Q Well, now, General MATSUI, you will agree with me, won't you, that this meeting was for the purpose of discussing what might be done by way of espionage and sabotage against Russia?

A Well, the officers stationed in countries neighboring Russia probably talked about Russia. The attaches stationed in Italy talked about the Mediterranean, and so on. Thus, each attache spoke of the subjects he was most concerned with in the light of his duty, and I do not recall the exact contents of our entire conversations at this date.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: I will leave it at that.

At page 15, you say that you were a supreme war councillor, General MATSUI. Am I right in saying that you resigned in March 1935?

A I don't recall the exact date. I believe, however, that you are right.

Why did you resign?

A I resigned as supreme war councillor because
I was appointed commander of the Taiwan garrison force.

O It wasn't because of any disagreement in policy, was it?

A No, that had nothing to do with it.

Q Then, I observe that you were appointed a cabinet advisor and that your opinion was never taken

18

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19 20

21

23

MATEUI CROSS 33,891

up concerning China and Asiatic problems, and that you never offered your own opinion.

Let me read to you what the accused KIDO says about this position of the cabinet councillor in the record at page 31,413:

"Q What is the duty, very briefly, of a cabinet councillor?

"A I think according to the government regulations concerning cabinet councillors their main function was to serve as consultants to the Prime Minister in connection with bringing about an early termination of the China Incident.

"Q Was that cabinet councillor a special position, created for that precise purpose?

"A Yes."

Now, how do you reconcile that statement of the accused KIDO with your statement that you never offered your opinion on any matter concerning China or Asia?

A Well, the original reason for the setting up of the system of cabinet councillors may be as is written in the KIDO diary, but actually we were advisors only in name, and although we gathered together once or twice a week at the Frime Minister's official residence, we did a lot of talking, but the talking never came to

5

1

3

8

9

11

12

14 15

16

17

19

21

20

22

23 24

anything more than that.

Q Perhaps it was a social meeting like the one in Berlin; was it?

A It was not a social meeting; it was political.

I think it would be better to call it a political
gesture of the government at the time.

Q Now, on page 16 you proceed to discuss the Greater Asia Association. Now, as the name would imply, the basic purpose of that Association was to create a Greater East Asia?

A Yes.

And the Asiatic countries included were China, Indo-China, Siam, Dutch Indies, Philippines, Malaya, l'ongolia and Siberia; is that right?

A It was our intention that we include all the so-called Asiatic peoples.

O And those that I have mentioned to you would be included in that class?

A Yes.

O Now, what nationalities in the Soviet Union did you consider Asiatic?

A I think that most of the peoples inhabiting the Siberian regions are Asiatics.

Q And that would include the Mongolians?

A That goes without saying.

9

7

8

1

3

4

11

12 13

14 15

16 17

18

19

20

22

23

24

Q The Burjats?

A Yes.

Q The Yakuta?

A Yes.

And the Tsukches? Now, were they included?

A I cannot -- I do not know this name, Tsukches.

Now, in order to enter into this Greater East.

Asia which you were advocating, it would be necessary
for these countries to break away; for example, Siberia
and Mongolia would have to break away from Russia?

A My principle of Great Asia was not a principle which called for the separation and independence of these peoples from the country with which they happened to be affiliated. We did not necessarily think it necessary for the -- for instance, the Yakuts Republic to leave the Soviet Union.

Correction: We thought it was quite all right if the Yakuts, for instance, remained in the Soviet Union or if India remained in the British Commonwealth. What we aimed at was that all the peoples of Asia should work together for the prosperity of Asia.

Q I suppose Manchuria would be an example of what vou are advocating now, would it?

A You could consider it that way.

Yes, and in the case of war with the UssR,
Manchuria would be a very valuable base of operation,
would it not?

A History has proved that in the case of a war between Russia and Japan, Manchuria would be a base.

Association was that these Asiatic countries and peoples that I have named were to be brought into the structure of Great East Asia, and if their entry could not be brought about by peaceful negotiations, the question would have to be settled by war.

A The basic principle underlying the Asia movement in Asia was the same as that as the movement for the federation of Europe which arose in Europe and of the Pan-American movement in America.

Q You were in China traveling in 1935 and 1936, General MATSUI?

CROSS

A Ves.

And you were preaching the gospel of this association?

A ves.

Q And subsequently you made tours of French Indo-China and the southern regions, did you not?

A That was way afterwards, after the outbreak of the Greater East Asia war.

O And when did the Greater East Asia war break out?

A 1941.

Q Were you in the Philippines?

A Yes.

Q In all these tours your effort was to convince these peoples of the propriety of their entering the structure of the Greater Asia Association?

A By that time, since we had established a Great Asia League, I went around exhorting the peoples of the countries of Great Asia to cooperate with the Great Asia League, but at the same time I had many friends in the south asiatic countries -- in French Indo-China, Siam, and the Philippines.

Former President Laurel, of the Philippine Republic,

1 2

3

4

5

6

9

10

8

11

13

14

15

17

18

20

21

23

24

MATSUI

3

1

2

5

7 8

9

10 11

12 13

> 14 15

16 17

18 19

20 21

22

23 24

25

and Professor Duran also had expressed their sympathy for Asianism several years before, and I had often met with them in Tokyo and talked with them on this noint.

To clear my own mind: "hen was the League established -- the date?

I don't recall the date. The Japanese Government assembled the representatives of the countries of Great Asia and held a conference in Tokyo.

O You say in your affidavit it was at the time of the first KONOYE Cabinet. Is that correct or was it the second KONOYE Cabinet?

I believe you are confusing the various societies with which I was connected at one time or another, namely, the Asia Association, the Asia Development League, and the Dai Nippon Asia Development League. These various societies did have the same principles of Asianism, but, depending upon the international circumstances of the time and of the internal political structure of Japan, they were established at different dates.

THE MONITOR: Japanese court reporter. ("hereupon, the Japanese court reporter read.)

THE INTERPRETER: Correction: I believe you

3

4

6

8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20 21

22 23

24 25 had been confusing the three societies with which I have been concerned: the Asia Association, the Asia Development League, and the Great Japan Asia Development League. These various societies had principles in common. They all advocated Asianism, but their form and structure differed from time to time according to the changing international circumstances and the changing internal structure of Japan.

THE MONITOR: The Internal Political situation in Japan.

I am not confusing anything. I asked you a simple question: "hen was the Dai Nippon Development League established

I think that was during the first KONOYE A Cabinet.

All right.

Now, you state in your affidavit, on page 19, that the organization, and I take it you are talking about the Dai Nippon Asia Development Association, published an organ. "Tas that the Dai Asia Shimbun?

It was not a newspaper; it was a magazine.

"hat was the name of it?

The Dai Asia Association published the Dai Asia Shugi, or The Principle of Great Asia. After the Asia Development League was established, the name

of the magazine became <u>Dai</u> <u>Asia</u>, or Great Asia, I think.

Now I show you a copy of that magazine for the month of January, 1941. That is the <u>Dai Asia</u>
Shugi. "ill you look at the article on page 2 of that magazine? **Did you** read it?

A Yes.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: I offer for identification, if the Tribunal pleases, the magazine <u>Dai Asia</u>
Shugi for January, 1941.

Dai Asia Share for the month of January, 1941, will receive exhalt No. 3499 for identification only.

(Whereupon, the magazine above referred was marked prosecution exhibit 3499 for identification.)

BRIGADIER NOLAN: And I offer in evidence the article written by the accused NATSUI appearing at page 2 of that January issue, 1941.

ACTING PRESIDENT: It will be admitted in evidence.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2396, being an excerpt from the <u>Dai Asia Shugi</u> for the month of January, 1941, will receive exhibit No. 3499-A.

(Thereupon, the document above

referred to was marked prosecution exhibit 3499-A and received in evidence.)

Greenberg & Yelde

BRIGADIER NOLAN: With the permission of the Tribunal I will read exhibit 3499-A. It is entitled a "Proposal for unification and rapid progress of various organizations for development of Asia by MATSUI, Iwane.

brought faith in Imperial history and awakened the whole nation together with the determination to face the present world situation. Also the conclusion of the Tripartite Pact between Japan, Germany and Italy and the recognition by the Nanking Kuomintang Government have forced them irresistibly to go on the road to construct a New Order in Asia against a long dominance of Great Britain, America and France in Asia. Therefore, the reconstruction of the various internal organs is urgently necessary in order to meet this serious situation together with the establishment of a so-called new structure in politics, economics and in various other spheres.

"Now, we have welcomed the 2601th year with great pride and pleasure in living in this sacred age of Showa to promote the building of Greater Asia with such resolution and structure. However, we cannot but consider the determination and conviction of the people both in and out of power quite insufficient.

3

1

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

Why do I say so? We must first glance at the recent administration of the national policy by the Government. The Tripartite Pact has already been concluded in accordance with the declaration made at the time of the formation of the KONOYE Cabinet and the great Imperial Rescript was issued to urge the people to make up their mind. But we feel that since then the Government has been too scrupulous in carrying out the foreign policy without firm faith to resolutely execute the national policy. Moreover, many politicians in and out of power and learned people have not, to our regret, come up to our expectation in their enthusiasm in this respect. Therefore, though the people at large are out of the so-called 'Obedient to the Imperial Rescript' principle and hoping for an epochmaking decisive step to be taken by the Government, they are, to say the truth, doubtful of the attitude of the Government, which is so slow to carry out its policy. Internal situation such as this is naturally reflected on the foreign countries, east and west, and it is regrettable that not only many Asiatic countries headed by China, but also several European powers are of late, beginning to make light of our determination and foothold.

"Hereupon, out of my dissatisfaction in the

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

present situation I urge the political thought, cultural, and other bodies for the development of Asia to rise up. The wise and the learned people as well as energetic young men belonging to these bodies are certainly willing, I believe, to carry out these measures. Furthermore, the conviction and enthusiasm of these apostles of the Asiatic revival with years of culture and researches will, I am sure, be a sole guiding power for carrying out the national policy, which had been hindered by the circumstances and interests of this complicated phase of life. propose the unification of these Asia revival bodies with a view of their cooperation. Though these bodies have different objectives and their nature, politically and economically, are different as are their histories and organizations, their chief aims are of course the unification and rehabilitation of the Asiatic races. Yet, up to the present, as their thoughts and standpoints differed, they have not been the same at least in their measures and expectation. To the contrary, these bodies are acting independently as they please, far from answering the requirement of the so-called 'present New Structure of Society.' Moreover, such different organizations of these very bodies have disturbed the people's faith and ideal in

9

2

17

19

20

21

22

24

1

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

13

14

15

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

the Asiatic Revival Policy, unable to meet the present situation where national solidarity is cried. Such being the case, recently we have organized the League of the Asiatic Development Bodies, exerting efforts for more than a year to unite all these bodies but with a regrettable result at present. Therefore, we want to take a drastic measure to unite and adjust all these bodies into one organization and to control and guide it by a uniform thought and faith together with starting a new collective activity by concentrating the hitherto separate and duplicated efforts of all these bodies. We hope also to correct and guide the concept of the Asiatic Revival maintained by the people in and out of the Government to unify and lead their ideals on the right path. Thus, what this organization aims at must, of course, harmonize with the Government's policy and sometimes it will advise and encourage them to assist their Asiatic Revival policy with all its might. Furthermore, its ambition is to become the nucleus of the nation's cultural idea of Asiatic Revival at home and abroad and to start an enlightenment movement for the nations, east and west, with a view to join the movement of the Imperial Rule Assistance started by the Asiatic Revival organizations. MATSUI

1

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

"In spite of many Asiatic Revival bodies established in the country, several new ones are now being organized as a natural expression of dissatisfaction with the old ones. Therefore, some measure to control them is urgent. Although these old bodies have, of course, respective histories and special circumstances, their unification will not be difficult if treated with laws and it will not be so hard for it to continue the work and aims of the old ones under the consistent control. In short, in controlling, we must depend upon the effectiveness of each person and organization. Earnestly, we desire all the members of the various bodies to agree with us, and the authorities of the China Affairs Board (KOAIN), who are naturally central figures of this movement being already leaders of the League, to contemplate over this matter.

"As indicated above, here we suggest the unification of all the Asiatic Revival Bodies. We desire all the conscious apostles for the cause of Asiatic Revival to rise and cooperate with one another to guide the people. After all, the present situation has become clear in its destination and does not allow us to hesitate. If we are constrained and overcautious to act now, we shall entangle the situation

43

4

20

21

24

MATSUI

1

"In spite of many Asiatic Revival bodies established in the country, several new ones are now being organized as a natural expression of dissatisfaction with the old ones. Therefore, some neasure to control them is urgent. Although these old bodies have, of course, respective histories and special circumstances, their unification will not be difficult if treated with laws and it will not be so hard for it to continue the work and aims of the old ones under the consistent control. In short, in controlling, we must depend upon the effectiveness of each person and organization. Earnestly, we desire all the members of the various bodies to agree with us, and the authorities of the China Affairs Board (KOAIN), who are naturally central figures of this movement being already leaders of the League, to contemplate over this matter.

"As indicated above, here we suggest the unification of all the Asiatic Revival Bodies. We desire all the conscious apostles for the cause of Asiatic Revival to rise and cooperate with one another to guide the people. After all, the present situation has become clear in its destination and does not allow us to hesitate. If we are constrained and over-cautious to act now, we shall entangle the situation

9

17

10

11

13

15

16

19

20

21

22

23 24

.

thus misleading the country at the crossroads of life or death. It is, of course, necessary to listen to the voice of the nation for those who want to guide the national policy with sincerity and good faith. However, we cannot approve very much of shirking responsibility under such a pretext or following an easy-going course, especially now when the decision of our national politics depends entirely upon the determination to put our national policy towards Greater Asia into effect. I feel most deeply our responsibility as apostles of the Asiatic Revival under the present satuation, and this is the reason why I appeal to our normades to rise at once."

BY BRIGADIER ispeal (Continued):

Q Now, General HATSUI, I want to ask you just one or two questions about this article. In what way was the government too scrupulous in carrying out its foreign policy?

A At the time, hostilities between Japan and China were in progress, and, therefore, some of the government's policies towards Asia as a whole were imbued with a strong Asianistic spirit. But, on the other hand, in view of the situation within Japan, especially in view of the economic situation of our country, there were many people who tried to think in

6

130

10

13

14

15

16

17 18

20

19

21 22

23

25

terms that were as negative as possible. Hemmed in between these two extremes the government's policies were very vascillating, and I felt strongly at the time that the government's policies were too weak and dilly-dal' zing.

Q Now, the Tri-Partite Pact had been signed; there had lean a move into Indo-China. What did you want the government to do?

A .y the year, and was mainly cultural and ideological, and i now to idea of advocating a policy towards the Larvic sometries of force or of intentionally setting up cursolves against the European and American bothers But, as the sens time, in view of the interactional situation then prevailing and of Japan's national secondth as compared to this international mitua ach, I felt that we should not just sit idly by, that we should not take a negative attitude. As an example, I will tell you that my ideas were quite different from those of the Indian leader, Gandhi, and his Swaraj movement which was a negative movement based on the principle of the Hindu religion. The fundamental spirit which animated me was the spirit of the foundation of the Japanese Empire, the spirit of Bushido or the way of the warrior, and the spirit of the doctrines of Buddhism of which I was an earnest

```
1 advocate, and I felt that even if Japan were to throw
2 herself away -- if all Japan were to be offered up as
3 a sacrifice, she should give up herself for the sake
4 of Asia.
           Correction: Even if I, myself, gave myself
6 up as a sacrifice, I would give up my life for the
7 sake of the welfare and reconstruction of the Asiatic
  people; and, even if all Japan was to be sacrificed,
  she should give herself up for the sake of Asia.
10
           THE MONITOR: In the spirit of the old saying
  which goes something like this: that is, in order to
12
  do a good deed, one may sacrifice his own life.
13
           ACTING PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen
14
  minutes.
15
                 (Whereupon, at 1045, a recess was
16
       taken until 1100, after which the proceed-
17
       ings were resumed as follows:)
18
19
20
```

22

23 24

3

10

13

14

15.

16

17

18

21

22

24

25

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far Last is now resumed.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Brigadier Nolan.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: May it please the Tribunal, I have only one or two matters to take up which will not occupy very much time.

BY BRIGADIER NOLAN (Continued):

Q General MATSUI, on page 20 of your affidavit, the English version, you make reference to the Ladybird incident. Now yesterday you took some trouble to tell us that you were responsible for all operational matters. I suggest to you that the bombardment of a British gunboet, the Ladybird, comes within this classification.

A I also think so.

Q Then you were responsible for the bombardment of that gunbort, were you?

A I take full responsibility without hesitation.

of the 10th frmy to tender his apology to the British naval commander-in-chief, and I also observe that you take no responsibility for the bombing of the Panay.

Thy did you go to see Admiral Yarnell about that incident?

Was it not the proper function of the naval commander,

Japanese, to go to the U.S. Navy commander?

A The main purpose of my request for an interview

with Admiral Yarnell was discussion on American rights and interests in the Shanghai area.

THE MONITOR: Shanghai-Nanking area.

A (Continuing) And even though it was the Navy that was responsible for the bombing of the ship, it was -- the Panay was a ship belonging to the American Navy and as I was directing joint army-navy operations in that district I felt that, although it wasn't my direct responsibility, it was in accordance with Bushido to express at least a word of regret to Admiral Yarnell.

- Q As a matter of fact, the naval units were under your operational command, were they not?
- A No, not so. They were entirely independent. They were under the control of the Navy.
- 0 Who issued the operation orders which were followed and carried out by those naval units?
- A It was the then Vice Admiral HASEGAWA who was then Commander of the Japanese Fleet in Chinese Waters.
- Q And was he under your command for eperational purposes?
 - A No, not at all. He was independent.
- Q Then how could you direct joint operations without the Navy being under your operational control?
- A In order to carry out joint operations with the Navy, which was independent, we acted in cooperation

2

5

6

8

10

11

13

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

with each other.

Q Now at page 21, at the bottom, you speak of a contribution of 10,000 yen to a Reverend Jackinough in Shanghai. Where did the money come from?

33,910

A well, 10,000 yen is such a small sum that I was really quite ashamed, but since I did not possess even that amount I used the money of the -- the official funds of my headquarters.

Q Now in 1941 -- and this is the last topic I want to discuss -- what was your attitude towards the then negotiations with /merica?

A During the period when I was fighting in the Shanghai-Nanking area against the Chinese the attitude of the American officials was more or less neutral and they did not, comparatively speaking, they did not find much to criticize me. Correction: I could find nothing criticizable in their attitude. And, therefore, when I met Admiral Yarnell I told him that in the future whatever incidents may break out in Shanghai and elsewhere or in the Pacific we men in the fighting service of Japan and America should cooperate with each other in maintaining peace in the Pacific Tree, and to this sentiment of mine Idmiral Yarnell fully agreed.

Q And was that your sentiment in 1941?

A No, that was my sentiment which I expressed

4

6

8

9

11

12

15

16

17

19

20

22

23

24

in 1938.

Q "ell, what about 1941?

A I will have to go back slightly to explain this point. In China, as I have just told you, I held such sentiments towards America in 1938 -- correction: at that time. But in January 1938 the President of the United States made a speech in the course of which he mentioned Japan's attitude towards Asia and actions in Asia in language with which I found it difficult to agree. I expressed at the time my dissatisfaction with those statements to a correspondent of the New York Times in Shanghai.

Q All I went you to tell me, General MATSUI, is were you in favor of carrying on negotiations with the United States in the year 1941.

A Of course it was my earnest desire that pending issues between Japan and the United States be settled through peaceful negotiations. But to tell you frankly of what I thought of the situation at the time, I felt that a Japan-American war had already broken out. It was almost as if a war had already begun.

Q Now, you wrote an article in the July issue of the Dai Asia Shugi in 1941. I will show you the magazine. If you will please show the witness 2397.

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the

With

2

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

to

11

13

14

16

17

19

21

22

23

24

witness.)

Q (Continuing) At page 10, General MATSUI. You wrote that article, didn't you?

A Yes.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: I offer for identification the magazine Dai Asia Shugi for the month of July 1941.

CLERK OF THE COURT: The Dai Asia Shugi for the month of July 1941 will receive exhibit No. 3500 for identification only.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit
No. 3500 for identification.)

BRIGADIFR NOLAN: And I offer in evidence the article appearing in that number of that magazine at page 10.

ACTING PRESIDENT: It will be admitted.

CLURK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 2397, being an excerpt from the Dai Asia Shugi for July 1941, will receive exhibit No. 3500-A.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit
No. 3500-A and received in evidence.)

BRIGADIER NOLAN: With the permission of the Tribunal, I will read the exhibit. It is entitled "The Settlement of the China Incident and the Problem

of the United States.

3

1

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

21

22

24

25

"I. A lukewarm argument for a compromise with the United States is being put out from a certain quarter. It is certainly difficult to comprehend when I hear that today when the hostile feeling of the United States is so acute, compromise with that country is being taken up seriously even if it may be only in one quarter. When a compromise with the United States is advocated from one quarter, its influence at once extends to Chungking, Nanking, Thailand, French Indo-China and the Netherlands East Indies, and casts a gloomy shadow upon our national policy. The reason why the Netherlands East Indies suddenly took a firm attitude and the Japanese-Netherlands Parley is on the brink of a breakdown, is solely due to the fact that the Netherlands East Indies received the impression that Japan would submit to the United States. The strengthening of the war attitude by Chungking, the wavering of French Indo-China, the uncasiness of Manking, are all truly the effect brought about by the lukewarm argument for a Japanese-American compromise.

"In order to complete the Holy War, strengthen the peoples' spiritual unit and make the Asiatic races trustingly place their confidence in Japan, it is necessary first of all to sweep away such a servile argument for a compromise with the United States.

13

15 16

17

19

20 21

22 23

24

25

The basis of the argument for a compromise with the United States seems to lie mostly in the idea that by compromising with the United States it would be possible to stop the aid to Chungking, make them cooperate in the development of the Nanking Regime, obtain American loans, and at the same time, through American cooperation secure natural resources in the Southern regions. However, this is a fantastic mistake. In the same manner that America considers England her first line of defense, she also considers Chungking and Batavia her first line of defense.

"Therefore, from the start, there is no reason for America seriously to consider a compromise with Japan. If such a hint were dropped to someone, that is a plan of the American authorities. America wants to divert the fleet at Hawaii to the Atlantic Ocean and enter the war, but if she does this, the Treaty of the Tripartite Alliance will make itself felt. The United States has neither the preparation nor the power to wage a two-front operation. She wants to somehow skillfully hold Japan down for awhile by utilizing the groups in Japan advocating the status quo, the pro-Anglo-American groups, and the groups advocating dependency on the U.S. and Britain. She wants to deceive Japan skillfully and prolong matters

6

7 8

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

without taking a definite step, and in the meantime make full war preparations. This is their true intention. If we are fooled by such a trick it would be disastrous. Needless to say, we will fall from a position of certain victory to that of certain defeat.

"We absolutely must not come to a compromise with the U.S. when things are what they are at this time. If we do such a thing, the significance of the China Incident will be lost. The significance of the War for the construction of the New Order which aims at the ideal of one family of Asiatic Nations, rehabilitation of Asia, and the liberation of Asia, will come to nought. Not only that, but it will violate the spirit of the Tripartite Alliance for which an Imperial Rescript has already been promulgated. It would become a retrogression of Japan's world policy. The spirit of the Tripartite Alliance is the important thing, rather than the wording. Its spirit enables each nation to have its rightful place in the world. Germany in Europe, and Japan in Asia, are both respectively fighting the war for the establishment of a New Order. How can we violate this lofty aim and international faith for the purpose of a momentary profit.

"As for Japan, she has work which must be performed regardless of America's attitude. They are the cutting of the route of aid to Chiang Kai-shek,
the elimination of enemy nations together with aid
to cooperating nations, and the strengthening of the

Tripartite Axis.

"The first is the economic development of China in accordance with the Joint Declaration of Japan, Manchukuo and China; joint national defense; and the exchange of culture.

"The second is the economic development in accordance with the economic agreement with French Indo-China; and joint national defense.

"The third is the strengthening of friendly relations with Thailand; and positive cooperation to fulfillment of her /TN: Thailand's/ wish to recover her lost territories.

"Persistency is a disease. If one is persistent in the idea of wanting to somehow settle the China Incident early, he becomes weak minded already at that moment.

"A good soldier forgets his enemy. As long as it was declared that Chiang Kai-shek will be ignored, we might as well forget his existence. The best would be to take the attitude of 'Are there such things as the Chungking Regime and Chiang Kai-shek still somewhere in China?' In reality, the immediate

 enemies are now clearly Britain and the United States, and the group of democratic nations. This is already common knowledge of the people. If we now come to a compromise with Britain and the United States, and think of trying to settle the Incident through Anglo-Sexon cooperation, how can we ever face the spirits of the one hundred thousand departed heroes? Here, in the name of the one hundred thousand dead heroes, I absolutely oppose any compromise with the United States. If in the near future the United States declares war against Germany, our nation must also rise unhesitatingly in accordance with the obligation of the Tritartite Alliance. This is the attitude of the nation of the Imperial Way /Kodo/ and of the Way of the Samurai /Bushido/."

Which is all I have to say on cross-examination.

ACTING PRESIDENT: I have one question on
behalf of a Member of the Tribunal.

You stated on the 24th of November that NAKAYAMA and HIDAKA reported atrocities committed by Chinese troops in Nanking. How many cases were reported to you?

THE WITNESS: Your Honor, are you referring to outrages committed by the Chinese soldiers?

ACTING PRESIDENT: Yes.

THE WITNESS: I did not hear any specific facts in regard to those. They only told me, conveyed to me of general rumors in regard to those cases.

MATSUI 33,919

Reichers & Dua

ACTING PRESIDENT: All right. Another question has just been handed me.

Do you know of any case in which a Japanese soldier was punished for atrocities committed in Nanking beyond mere reprimand by his superior? In other words, do you know of anyone who was tried by court-martial and given a sentence?

THE WITNESS: On this point, Mr. TSUKAMOTO, who was formerly Judge Advocate of the Shanghai Expeditionary Force, and Mr. OGAWA, who was formerly Judge Advocate General of the Tenth Army, have testified and according to their testimony the number of officers and men who were tried before a court-martial and convicted reached over one hundred.

ACTING PRESIDENT: You have no other knowledge, then, about the number or the record of their trials?

THE WITNESS: I did hear at the time that two or three cases were being tried in Shanghai. After my return to Japan I tried to investigate the matter, but as the documents in question had been burned and were missing, I was unable to carry it any further and I was unable to ascertain the actual figures.

ACTING PRESIDENT: My question was directed to the atrocities committed in Nanking.

THE WITNESS: Yes. I was referring to Nanking

33,920

also in my reply.

1 2

-

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

17

16

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Mattice.

THE WITNESS: I should like --

ACTING PRESIDENT: There is no question.

THE WITNESS: --to add that the offenses for which these men were tried were rape, robbery, looting, outrages and murder.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Logan.

MR. LOGAN: I should like to ask a few questions on behalf of KIDO.

ACTING PRESIDENT: On cross-examination?
MR. LOGAN: Redirect.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Very well.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. LOGAN:

Q General MATSUI, this last document that was shown you, exhibit 3500-A, the article appearing in the Dai Asia Shugi in July 1941, you speak about the pro-Anglo-American groups in Japan. Do you include in that group the court officials around the throne?

A I don't think that court circles were necessarily pro-British or pro-American, but there may have been such people among them.

Q Well, whom did you include in the pro-Anglo-American groups?

3

6

7 8

10

11

13

14

17

18

16

19

21

23 24

25

A I should not like to say specifically such and such a person was pro-American or pro-British, but I think it is unavoidable that those who had close ties with Britain and America should be imbued with pro-British or pro-American ideologies.

Q Were you acquainted with the views of the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal at that time?

A I have never talked directly with the Lord Keeper on such problems so I do not know very much about that.

Q Dia you ever hear what his views were at that time?

A Well, of course, people said all sorts of things and there were all sorts of rumors, so I really can't say anything for sure. But on the whole, from my own observation, I felt that the Lord Keeper was somewhat more pro-British and pro-American than such people as myself. But at the same time, he was a patriotic Japanese.

Thank you, General.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Mattice.

MR. NATTICE: No redirect. That concludes the individual defense of this accused.

ACTING PRESIDENT: The accused will resume his place in the dock.

3

4

6

9

10

12

13

15

17 18

20

21

19

22

24

25

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)
ACTING PRESIDENT: We will now return to the

presentation of the defense of the accused OSHIMA.

Mr. Cunningham.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: We now offer the evidence of defense witness TAKAHASHI. However, it is our understanding that the witness will not be called for cross-examination and, therefore, we offer his affidavit, defense document 2082, for the purpose of showing that Mr. Himmler never contacted or had an interview with Mr. OSHIMA at the time described in the Himmler memorandum.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Is your number 2082 correct, or 2083? You have both of them here.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: 2083.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Then, in the following page, you refer to it as 2082.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: 2083, as I understand it, is the affidavit of TAKAHASHI.

ACTING PRESIDENT: It will be admitted.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2083

will receive exhibit No. 3501.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3501 and received in evidence.)

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I now read exhibit 3501, skipping the formal parts, going to paragraph 2:

"I was on my post in Berlin as the Secretary of Protocol for the Japanese Ambassador in Berlin from about September, namely, immediately before OSHIMA, the ex-Ambassador to Germany, took his post, until January 1939.

"During this period all the conversations of Ambassador OSHIMA with high German officials were arranged beforehand by me as the Secretary of Protocol as to their date, time, place, etc. As far as I remember, there has never been any case in or about January 1939 that Mr. Himmler requested of an interview with the ex-Ambassador OSHIMA: No request was also made by ex-Ambassador OSHIMA to see Mr. Himmler."

We now offer defense document 2084, the affidavit of Hiroshi SUGIURA, for the purpose of corroborating the testimony of TAKAHASHI.

ACTING PRESIDENT: It may be admitted.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2084

will receive exhibit No. 3502.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3502 and received in evidence.)

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I offer to read exhibit 3502,

starting at the second paragraph:

"I served as the Secretary of Protocol of
the Japanese Embassy in Berlin during January and
August 1939 as the successor of Mr. Michitoshi TAKAHASHI. During this period every contact of Ambassador
OSHIMA with outside persons including German high officials was arranged through me as in the case of my
predecessor. As far as I remember, Mr. Himmler never
asked through me for an interview with Ambassador OSHIMA.
No request was also made by Ambassador OSHIMA to see
Mr. Himmler."

Before offering the interrogation of Ambassador Ott, the former German Ambassador to Japan, who was later relieved by Ambassador Stahmer in 1943, we wish to state that every effort was made to obtain the presence of Ambassador Ott as a witness before the Tribunal; however, it was impossible to secure his presence for cross-examination after repeated demands were made for a subpoena for his presence.

Later efforts were made to secure his presence as a defense witness by subpoena; however, the efforts were fruitless. However, we now offer defense document 2475, which is an interrogation of Ambassador Ott, together with his cross-examination, taken by me at Shanghai as part of the evidence of the witness Ott,

for the purpose of explaining some German documents referring to OSHIMA, and I offer to read the interroga-2 tion -- only the direct examination. 3 ACTING PRESIDENT: It will be admitted in evidence. 5 CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2475 6 will receive exhibit No. 3503. (Whereupon, the document above 8 referred to was marked defense exhibit 9 No. 3503 and received in evidence.) 10 MR. CUNNINGHAM: I am only offering the direct 11 examination, and Mr. Tavenner will no doubt offer the 12 cross-examination. 13 MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, I understand that counsel proposes to read only the examination 15 16 on his interrogatories, but that the interrogatories 17 as a whole are introduced in evidence as this exhibit. 18 ACTING PRESIDENT: That is what I understood 19 when I admitted them. 20 MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yes, that is why I wanted to 21 correct that. 22 ACTING PRESIDENT: Only the direct examination 23 will be admitted. 24 MR. CUNNINGHAM: And if Mr. Tavenner wishes

to offer the cross-examination, then he may.

1 2 3

The purpose is that I want to waive the redirect examination, and I do not wish to offer the entire document but only that part which I wish to read into evidence.

ACTING PRESIDENT: The only trouble, as I see it, is that if the prosecution does offer that part in evidence, you have one document with two exhibit numbers.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: The direct examination and the cross-examination can be given the same exhibit number, as far as I am concerned.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Proceed.

2

3 4

6

7

9

8

10 11

12

13

15 16

17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24

25

"Question 1. Please state your name, address and nationality.

"Answer: Eugen Ott.

"Question 2. Please state your official positions in Japan, and the periods during which you held each of these positions.

Please refer to curriculum vitae "Answer: given in SHIRATORI interrogation."

To prevent reading that we will emphasize that merely when it is read in the SHIRATORI interrogation.

"Question 3. Please read the attached document No. 1, which is a copy of the prosecution's exhibit 508, tendered to the International Military Tribunal for the Far Bast. Is it a telegram dated 27 October 1939, and addressed from Woermann to you as the German Ambassador in Tokyo?

"Answer: Yes.

"Question 4. According to this telegram, 'the Reich Foreign Minister requests to support in all respects Ambassador OSMINA, who after his return, will work further for German-Japanese friendship.

"During Mr. OSHIMA's stay in Japan after his return (from December 1939 until January 1941), did you or the German Embassy render any help or support to Mr. OSHIMA in the sense of this telegram?

"Answer: None whatever.

"Question 5. During the above mentioned period, did Mr. OSHIMA ask you or the German Embassy for any help or support in the sense of this telegram?

"Answer: Never.

"Question 6. According to this telegram, the Reich Foreign Minister requested you 'to transmit in code and without changes telegrams, delivered there by Mr. OSHIMA to the Reich Foreign Minister personally and to take care of the forwarding of letters addressed to the Reich Foreign Minister, unopened insofar as they are sealed, by sure and speedy route.'

"Did Mr. OSMIMA, during the above mentioned period of his stay in Japan, hand to you or the German Embassy any telegrams or letter addressed to the Reich Foreign Minister?

"Answer: None at all.

"Question 7. Please read the attached document No. 2 which is a copy of the prosecution's exhibit No. 511 tendered to the INTFE. Is this a telegram dated 23 February 1940 and addressed

1 2

1,1

2

4

3

6

9

10

12

14

15

17

19

21

23

22

24

from Stahmer and Ott to the State Secretary?
"Answer: Yes.

"Question 8. In this telegram it is stated that:
'After my arrival here I found such Japanese already
known to me as OShI.A, SHIMATORI, TERAUCHI, ISHII,
etc., in an unchanged friendly attitude and ready
for every support.' I wonder why in this telegram,
which was signed jointly by Stahmer and you, the
singular personal pronoun 'I', 'my', 'me' was used.
Please explain the reason. (Please state what part
you played in the drafting of this telegram.)

"Answer: Drafted exclusively by Mr. Stahmer and has my name attached only according to the official regulations, in order to secure transmission of the cipher telegram by the Japanese postal authorities.

"Question 10. Did OSHIMA, after this visit of Mr. Stahmer to Japan, actively work for a closer relation between Japan and Germany under the influence of Mr. Stahmer?

"Answer: No active work by OSHI.A in this respect as a result of Stahmer's influence.

"Question 11. Please read the attached document No. 3, which is a copy of the prosecution's exhibit No. 516 tendered to the IMTFE. Is this a telegram dated 12 June 1940 and addressed from you to the German Government?

"Answer: Yes.

"Question 12. In paragraphs 2-4 of this telegram you stated that: 'each German and Italian move which reveals the concern over American attitude in the near future would only be a cue to the government and the press which is close to it to make new courtship of America. The government would further try, as in the case of the Asama Maru, to impute to us the intention of using Japan as a tool of our policy, an argument which would not be ineffective with the known suspicion of the Japanese. The Embassy is still endeavoring to stir up Japanese ill feeling against America by influencing the press and leading political personalities in a way deemed proper. I myself have expressed the thought in many discussions with leading political personalities as, for example, KONOYE, SUETSUGU and KUHARA that the interests and activity of America . . . in the racific Area and therefore a conflict between Japan and America is in the long run unavoidable.

with the Embassy, ambassadors OSHIMA and SHIRATONI and circles closely connected with them are operating

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

in the same direction.'

With reference to this telegram, you answered in May 1947, to the questions by Mr. Charles B. Caudle, counsel for defendant SHIRATORI, as follows:

""Question: I now hand you copy of Exhibit No. 516, dated 12 June 1940, from you to your government, wherein you speak of Japanese-American relations among other matters, and call your special attention to the second, third and fourth paragraphs thereof. Will you please explain in detail just what you mean by the same covering historical background, Japanese psychology and existing conditions at the time the communication was sent(and a copy was handed to witness.)

"'Answer: The background of this report of June 12th, 1940, is as follows:

imminent, and the Eritish situation was very precartious, centering around Dunkirk. The only effective relief which might keep up the resistance power of England, and work against the early settlement of war, could come from the United States of America, and was asked from them very urgently. Therefore the German Government endeavored to hamper such a relief, and

.

.

3

5

7

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

24

25

considered as a useful way a continued tension in the Pacific area, which might prevent the United States from removing their attention and fighting forces from the Facific to the Atlantic.

"'It was a complicated matter to advance such a policy upon Japan because the Japanese attitude was much divided, as it is given in the first part of my report. In this situation I got instructions to back an Italian protest obviously against a Japanese measure in favor of the United States and contrary to the Italian interests - I do not recall the case exactly. When I present my objections to the Reich Government's intentions I had to avoid the permanent distrust of Ribbentrop that I was inclined to block his aims. Therefore I stressed in paragraphs Nos. 3 and 4 of my report that I was working in my own way and pointed to the cooperation of SHIRATORI and other Japanese persons known to Ribbentrop in order to impress him and to succeed in my objections.

"'Question: Did you mean, in the fourth paragraph of this document that the Embassy, OSHIMA and SHIRATORI worked together in a common program, based upon a mutual understand-

ing and common agreement, and if so what was the 1 aim? 2 No, I did not mean that because " ! Answer: 3 there was no such agreement. 4 "'Question: What, if anything did SHIRATORI 5 do in this regard? 6 SHIRATORI, as far as I know, " ! Answer: 7 warned by private talks, and sometimes by the 8 Press, against the courting of the United States, 9 10 after they had enforced hard economic measures 11 upon Japan. 12 "'Question: Was this a part of a concerted 13 plan taken by him, OSHIMA and you? 14 " Answer: No, it was not a common plan, 15 I had only private talks with each of them 16 separately, and OSHIMA kept himself much apart 17 from political activities during his stay in 18 Japan. 19 "'Question: "ere you ever in the company of 20 SHIRATORI and OSHIMA at the same time for the 21 purpose of carrying out this socalled political 22 cooperation? 23 "'Answer: No, I was not. 24

was close cooperation between you?

25

"'Question: Then why do you state that there

ing and common agreement, and if so what was the 1 aim? "'Answer: No, I did not mean that because 3 there was no such agreement. 4 "'Question: What, if anything did SHIRATORI 5 do in this regard? " Answer: SHIRATORI, as far as I know, 7 8 warned by private talks, and sometimes by the 9 Press, against the courting of the United States, 10 after they had enforced hard economic measures upon Japan. 12 "'Question: Was this a part of a concerted 13 plan taken by him, OSHIMA and you? 14 "'Answer: No, it was not a common plan, I had only private talks with each of them separately, and OSHIMA kept himself much apart from political activities during his stay in Japan. 19 "'Question: "ere you ever in the company of SHIRATORI and OSBIMA at the same time for the purpose of carrying out this socalled political cooperation? "'Answer: No, I was not.

11

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

"'Question: Then why do you state that there was close cooperation between you?

"'Answer: As I stated before, I used this expression in order to give weight to the mes-sage, and to carry through my objections. I might add that I used the names of KONOYE and SUETSUGU for the same reason. ! "Can you make for Mr. OSHIMA the same statement as the one you made in Peking in May 1947 for Mr. SHIRATORI, with reference to your telegram dated 12 June 1940 (exhibit No. 516)? Yes, I do so." "Answer: ACTING PRESIDENT: We will adjourn until 1:30. (Whereupon, at 1200, a recess was taken.)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at 1330.

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Resuming the direct examination of Ott, question 13, page 5:

"Question 13: Did OSHIMA, or did he not, tell you that he was doing actively something for stirring up ill relations or feelings against America?

"Did OSHIMA, or did he not, do something for stirring up ill feeling against America?

"Answer: He did nothing but to share the suspicions of the Japanese press concerning the sincerity of the Anglo-Saxon Powers.

"Question 14: Whom do you mean concretely by 'OSHIMA, SHIRATORI and circles closely connected with them?'

"Answer: Groups of politically interested individuals with whom they were associated.

"Question 15: Please read the attached

24

document No. 4, which is a copy of the prosecution's exhibit No. 560 tendered to the IMTFE. Is this your telegram, dated 13 December 1940, sent to the German Government?

"Answer: Yes.

"Question 16: In this telegram it is stated that 'For the previous history, I know that Foreign Minister has repeatedly offered the Ambassadorial post in Berlin to OSHIMA, who, however, declined it in order to be able to continue his politically active work for the Tripartite Pact in Japan. Did OSHIMA, or did he not, during the period from December, 1939, until 27 September 1940 (namely, from Mr. OSHIMA's return to Japan until the conclusion of the Tripartite Pact) work actively for promoting the conclusion of the Tripartite Pact?

"Answer: No, he did not have any part in the preliminary negotiations or the conclusion of the Tripartite Pact. He was not consulted. I am sure of this.

"Question 17: During or prior to the negotiations for the Tripartite Pact in September, 1940, did you (or Mr. Stahmer), or did you (or Mr. Stahmer) not, ask Mr. OSHIMA for his advice or opinion?

I did not. Neither did Mr. "Answer: Stahmer. "Question 18: Did OSHIMA during the 4 period from 28 September 1940 until January, 1941, 5 (namely, from the conclusion of the Tripartite Pact 6 until Mr. OSHIMA's departure for his post in 7 Germany) work politically for the Tripartite Pact. The only thing I can recall "Answer: 8 was an interview with the press on the subject." Mr. Tavenner will complete the cross-10 11 examination. MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, I 12 offer in evidence the cross-interrogatories of Mr. 13 Ott, which appear in this document from pages 13 to 14 34, inclusive, and suggest that they be given the 15 16 number 3503-A. 17 ACTING PRESIDENT: How about pages 11 and 18 12? 19 MR. TAVENNER: That is correct. It is 20 from 11 to 34. 21 ACTING PRESIDENT: It will be admitted under 22 exhibit No. 3503-A. 23 CLERK OF THE COURT: Cross-interrogatory 24 for Mr. Eugen Ott will receive exhibit No. 3503-A. 25 (Whereupon, the document above

referred to was marked prosecution exhibit No. 3503-A and received in evidence.)

MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, I do not propose to read the cross-interrogatories as the only purpose is in the introduction by Ott of the affidavits, which are made a part of his interrogatories. For instance, at page 12, you will see in the last paragraph that the answer is: "I herewith file in evidence paper No. 1 consisting of a photostatic copy..." of a certain telegram. And, a similar question is asked and answer is made in the manner in which each of the three affidavits are filed.

Therefore, each of the three affidavits constitute part of the evidence and a part of the document just admitted in evidence.

I will read a part of the first telegram, which is a telegram of December 31, 1939, from Ott to Berlin. It appear on page 18. I will read the second paragraph:

"The Japanese Government is functioning in this year-end under the heaviest foreign and domestic political pressures. The three big problems of the Japanese foreign policy; settlement of the China question, understanding with America, and adjustment with Russia, are yet to be solved. announcement of the opening of the Yangtse up to Nanking did not bring about the change of the American attitude which had been sought after. The American Ambbassador brought forward further demands with the ostensible objectives of the independence and free trade of China, at least of Central and South China. He is said to have demanded especially: gradual withdrawal of the troops except 8 garrisons to be left in North China, guarantee for the open door and the treaty rights of foreign nations accompanied by the dissolution of the monopolistic Japanese development company. The American attitude gave rise to disillusion after the initial high expectations which were nurtured by the intentional optimism of the Government. In order to avert the American pressure, the idea is being advocated of late in some circles (group garbled) to solve the China Incident by making concessions to Chiang Kaishek, to negotiate, if possible, with him concerning peace by abandoning the KONOYE declaration, and to utilize Wang Chiang-wei as a mere mediator for that purpose. The Army, particularly the China Army, was however till recently still determined to

establish a new central Government under Wang

23

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

adjustment with Russia, are yet to be solved. announcement of the opening of the Yangtse up to Nanking did not bring about the change of the American attitude which had been sought after. The American Ambbassador brought forward further demands with the ostensible objectives of the independence and free trade of China, at least of Central and South China. He is said to have demanded especially: gradual withdrawal of the troops except 8 garrisons to be left in North China, guarantee for the open door and the treaty rights of foreign nations accompanied by the dissolution of the monopolistic Japanese development company. The American attitude gave rise to disillusion after the initial high expectations which were nurtured by the intentional optimism of the Government. In order to avert the American pressure, the idea is being advocated of late in some circles (group garbled) to solve the China Incident by making concessions to Chiang Kaishek, to negotiate, if possible, with him concerning peace by abandoning the KONOYE declaration, and to utilize Wang Chiang-wei as a mere mediator for that purpose. The Army, particularly the China Army, was however till recently still determined to

establish a new central Government under Wang

3

1

4

5

6

7

9

8

10

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

21

22

24

'demands' is omitted) a great amount of independence and is always grappling with serious personnel difficulties. The negotiations with Russia are restricted on the details (settlement of the Manchurian border, fishing treaties), without touching the fundamental question of the Japan-Russian adjustment, in particular the Russian attitude toward China.

Minor counter claims of Russia, such as payment of the outstanding debt of 6 millions yen of the South Manchurian Railway, are causing difficulties."

I omit reading now to the sentence beginning in the third line on the last page of the telegram, which is page 21 of the document:

"As the foreign political pressure and serious internal differences continue to exist, neither a coalition cabinet capable of action nor the..." and here I pause to state that apparently the word "complete" has been omitted in the translation. To the Language Pool, the word "complete" is at the end of the third line that I was reading.

THE MONITOR: Mr. Tavenner, the document that has been marked and handed to us evidently has a very different prosecution number. If you would kindly tell us the number, we will be able to locate the Japanese document -- the corresponding one.

MR. TAVENNER: The defense document number is 2475.

THE MONITOR: And from what English page?

MR. TAVENNER: Page 21, the fifth line from the top of the page.

Let us omit the word "complete" rather than use it this time, and refer it to the Language Section.

I believe it will save us time.

So that the sentence reads:

"...neither a coalition cabinet capable of action nor the affilitation with any of the European power-groups is to be expected for the time being. According to the views of Ambassadors OSHIMA and SHIRATORI, who are working hard for overthrowing the present Cabinet, two or three more transit cabinets will be needed in order to bring about a drastic change of the course.

"Signed Ott."

I would like for the matter to be referred to the Language Pool for the addition of the word

"complete" before the word "affiliation," if that is correct.

ACTING PRESIDENT: It is so ordered.

MR. TAVENNER: I now desire to read the second affidavit which appears at page 25. The date is January 23, 1940. And I desire to read only the last part of the first paragraph appearing on page 26, beginning with the words "I am endeavouring..."

I was in error in referring to it as an affidavit. It is, of course, a telegram.

"I am endeavouring as the highest objective of my further action to achieve the release of the arrested persons. I have already presented these views for the time being unofficially to the Foreign Ministry of Japan. Step-by-step-tactics alone are in view of the Japanese mentality the only ones with prospect of success; this also corresponds to the urgent advices by ambassadors OS --" and the rest of the word is not written out -- "and S-H-I-R --" and the rest of the word is not written.

"Signed Ott."

I now desire to read the third and last telegram, which appears at page 30 of the document:
"26 January 1940

"Most urgent!

"complete" before the word "affiliation," if that is correct.

ACTING PRESIDENT: It is so ordered.

MR. TAVENNER: I now desire to read the second affidavit which appears at page 25. The date is January 23, 1940. And I desire to read only the last part of the first paragraph appearing on page 26, beginning with the words "I am endeavouring..."

I was in error in referring to it as an affidavit. It is, of course, a telegram.

"I am endeavouring as the highest objective of my further action to achieve the release of the arrested persons. I have already presented these views for the time being unofficially to the Foreign Ministry of Japan. Step-by-step-tactics alone are in view of the Japanese mentality the only ones with prospect of success; this also corresponds to the urgent advices by ambassadors OS --" and the rest of the word is not written out -- "and S-H-I-R --" and the rest of the word is not written.

"Signed Ott."

I now desire to read the third and last telegram, which appears at page 30 of the document:
"26 January 1940

"Most urgent!

. 17

"For the Foreign Minister

2

1

4

6

8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21

23

24

25

"I hear confidentially that the Japanese Foreign Office instructed Ambassador KURUSU to ask the German Foreign Office to put off the planned visit of Duke of Coburg till March or better April, on the ground that the time is not sufficient to prepare for such a high visit, and all the influential political persons are being occupied too much with the Diet. As no special missions from any foreign countries have been considered for the occasion of the national foundation anniversary, the Foreign Office asked to call the visit of Duke of Coburg as friendship mission. I expressed to a confident my personal anxiety that the Japanese conduct could cause strong annoyance in Berlin. I see the deeper reason for this strange attitude in the petty apprehension of the Japanese Government that the exclusive representation of Germany by a special mission might damage the neutral status of Japan in the eyes of third powers. In addition, the court circle is strongly agitated by the Anti-British wave caused by the 'Asamamaru' incident, and fears the intensification of the pro-German feeling of people by the visit of the Duke at the present moment. The fact that, as I learned most confidentially the Government considered shortly

"For the Foreign Minister

2

1

4

6

8

9

11

12 13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

22

23

24

25

"I hear confidentially that the Japanese Foreign Office instructed Ambassador KURUSU to ask the German Foreign Office to put off the planned visit of Duke of Coburg till March or better April, on the ground that the time is not sufficient to prepare for such a high visit, and all the influential political persons are being occupied too much with the Diet. As no special missions from any foreign countries have been considered for the occasion of the national foundation anniversary, the Foreign Office asked to call the visit of Duke of Coburg as friendship mission. I expressed to a confident my personal anxiety that the Japanese conduct could cause strong annoyance in Berlin. I see the deeper reason for this strange attitude in the petty apprehension of the Japanese Government that the exclusive representation of Germany by a special mission might damage the neutral status of Japan in the eyes of third powers. In addition, the court circle is strongly agitated by the Anti-British wave caused by the 'Asamamaru' incident, and fears the intensification of the pro-German feeling of people by the visit of the Duke at the present moment. The fact that, as I learned most confidentially the Government considered shortly

before the Asama case to prepare a pompous reception for the Duke as the guest of the state, justifies also this assumption.

"Ambassador OSHIMA also pointed to the Anti-British movement as the main reason for the sudden, a formally most unpleasant, retreat of the Japanese Government from the promise apparently given in Berlin. As a matter of fact, he sees, however, in this postponement of the journey possible advantage for our policy, as the Anti-British movement will be enabled to develop to the full extent, if it is not burdened with the suspect of being under German influence. According to an information received just now, the movement is spreading to broad party circles and could result in bitter fights in the Diet in February and March, probably bringing about the collapse of the Government. OSHIMA recommends to postpone the journey till April-May, but to reserve the decision as to the final time-table.

"I also propose to examine the following itinerary: Arrived in Japan a week later, immediate continuation of the trip to America and friendship visit to Japan on the way back. I would be grateful in any case, for the realizing of Stahmer's information journey. Ott."

2

5

. 8

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

20 21

22

23

24

That is all.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Before offering the next document I should like to clarify a matter. I only wish to introduce or offer the document with the exception of a few sentences which I do not wish to include and I would like to have an understanding that if the document is accepted, it is accepted with the understanding that those few sentences should be deleted.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Admitted under those conditions.

MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, there was a rebuttal interrogatory taken to the cross-interrogatory of Eugen Ott, which was processed and admitted in evidence. I cannot insist that counsel read it, but I want merely to call the Tribunal's attention to the fact that such a cross or rebuttal interrogatory is a part of this document.

ACTING PRESIDENT: You mean part of the document, exhibit 3503-A.

MR. TAVENNER: Part of document 3503. But by the manner in which 3503 was admitted in evidence, there could be some doubt as to whether or not it carried with it the remaining part of that document.

1

2

3

4 5

6

7 8

10

11

12

13

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

So I think the matter could be cleared up by declaring it to have been admitted as a part of document 3503 and then leave counsel to his own choice as to whether he reads it.

Knapp & Kappleau

ACTING PRESIDENT: He referred to the interrogatory on pages 15 and 16, I believe.

MR. TAVENNER: No, sir, it is at the very end of the document and consists of nine pages separately numbered from 1 to 10.

ACTING PRESIDENT: We don't seem to have that; at least I can't find it.

MR. TAVENNER: I desire to apologize to the Court for taking this time. The part that I thought had been processed apparently has not been. I have been given the additional set of questions constituting the rebuttal to the cross-interrogatories, but apparently it was not processed. I assumed that my copy was the same as the processed copy. In the light of that situation I desire to ask the privilege of introducing that rebuttal interrogatory in behalf of the prosecution if it is not introduced by the defense. These interrogatories were taken pursuant to an agreement, and now I find for the first time this moment that only part has actually been reproduced for admission in testimony.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Is there any objection to that on the part of the defense?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I wish to clear up the matter specifically. That was the reason I made the opening remark I made, that I was only introducing

-

as part of the evidence in this case the direct examination of the witness Ott, and I deemed it my privilege to waive the introduction of the redirect examination or the cross-interrogatories if I didn't see fit to introduce them as a part of the record in this case.

That is the first suggestion.

As to the second suggestion of Mr. Tavenner, that he offers in evidence as part of his case the cross-interrogatories, or the redirect examination as I chose to call it, I don't feel that he should be the one at this time to offer evidence in the prosecution's part of the case.

On the third proposition, I only processed that part which I proposed to introduce as evidence in this case and did not feel under any obligation to process the part which I chose to waive.

ACTING PRESIDENT: But you did process what is now exhibit 3503-A.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I admit that we processed the direct examination and Mr. Tavenner's cross-examination, but we did not process the redirect examination. I felt under no more obligation to introduce the redirect examination here as part of the record than I would feel required to redirect examine

as part of the evidence in this case the direct examination of the witness Ott, and I deemed it my privilege to waive the introduction of the redirect examination or the cross-interrogatories if I didn't see fit to introduce them as a part of the record in this case.

That is the first suggestion.

As to the second suggestion of Mr. Tavenner, that he offers in evidence as part of his case the cross-interrogatories, or the redirect examination as I chose to call it, I don't feel that he should be the one at this time to offer evidence in the prosecution's part of the case.

On the third proposition, I only processed that part which I proposed to introduce as evidence in this case and did not feel under any obligation to process the part which I chose to waive.

ACTING PRESIDENT: But you did process what is now exhibit 3503-A.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I admit that we processed the direct examination and Mr. Tavenner's cross-examination, but we did not process the redirect examination. I felt under no more obligation to introduce the redirect examination here as part of the record than I would feel required to redirect examine

the witness if he were actually present.

ACTING PRESIDENT: When you take interrogatories by commission or otherwise, it is customary for all the interrogatories to go in.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: That is not my understanding, your Honor. It is an optional matter for you to introduce at any time you see fit any part or all of a deposition, and you don't have to introduce it at all unless you see fit. That is my understanding of the practice.

ACTING PRESIDENT: You don't have to introduce it at all, but, on the other hand, if you do not
introduce it the other side has the right to introduce it once the interrogatories have been taken
and returned to court.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: That is not my understanding, any more than it would be the right of the prosecution to make the witness theirs after the close of the prosecution's case. The only condition under which I consider this could be made part of the prosecution's case is if and in the event there is permission to put in rebuttal evidence. That is my understanding. I may be wrong about it, but that is the reason why I did not introduce the redirect examination, because I did not see fit to do so.

 MR. TAVENNER: If it please the Tribunal, there would be no quarrel with counsel if he had elected not to introduce any part of the interrogation of Eugen Ott. But certainly the practice is not recognized in any court of admitting part of an interrogatory and voluntarily withholding or withdrawing another part.

ACTING PRESIDENT: The majority of the Court holds that the redirect interrogatory, or whatever you may call it, shall be admitted in evidence at such time as you may present it. In fact, that opinion seems to be unanimous.

MR. TAVENNER: Do I understand the ruling to mean it is admitted as part of document 3503, which is the defense exhibit, as distinguished from the prosecution presenting it as its own exhibit?

ACTING PRESIDENT: Unless there is some other objection to it, I would suggest that when admitted it be given the number 3503-B.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: There is no objection as far as what number to give it goes as long as there is no confusion about the thing, with the understanding that only that part of the document that is offered is to be part of the record if the document is accept-

ed in evidence.

. 1

2

3

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I now tender in evidence defense document 2858, which is a voluntary statement made by Ambassador Ott at Peiping, in explanation of his position in Japanese-German relations and his interest and his participation. This statement covers many matters about which the witness would be required to testify if he were present; and the strictly relevant subjects are so interwoven with the few irrelevant matters that we ask the Court's indulgence in permitting us to read the entire statement, with the exception of course noted, in order to get the full context and meaning. Since this statement was not obtained by the counsel for the defense, it is neither in the form nor strictly in the substance which we would desire. However, it is the best available information we have, and since we have done everything possible to obtain the personal appearance here of Ambassador Ott, we feel that this statement should be admitted for what it is worth in our defense.

We now offer defense document 2528 excepting the last two sentences of paragraph 3, page 4, starting after the words "Chiang Kai-shek" to the end of that paragraph.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Where is that on page 4?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: After the word "Chiang Kaishek" in the third paragraph to the end of the paragraph.

ACTING PRESIDENT: That means the rest of the affidavit, then, doesn't it?

. 17

MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, objection is made to the introduction in evidence of this document in its entirety. It is a statement prepared by Eugen Ott, depicting his personal history prior to his dispatch to Japan in 1933, the main phase of his military work in Japan from 1933 to 1938, and his activity as German Ambassador in Tokyo. It is very general in form and certainly in no sense could it be said to be a proper document in the individual phase of the accused OSHIIA, and strange to say, with the exception of the very sentence which counsel desires to delete, at no point in this document is the name OSHIMA used, with the exception of that one sentence which counsel desires to delete.

ACTING PRESIDENT: I notice it is dated 15 November 1945.

MR. TAVENNER: In China.

ACTING PRESIDENT: In China. I referred to it as an affidavit, but it does not seem to be an affidavit.

MR. TAVENNER: No, sir. It is a voluntary statement. The only direct reference to OSHIMA in this statement is on page 10 in connection with the no-separate-peace pact of December 11, 1941, in which he says, "I received, as far as I remember, the draft of

2-1

an agreement drawn up by the German Government, which was presumably agreed upon with the Japanese officials in Berlin." This is not a disputed passage.

ACTING PRESIDENT: We have no page 10 in our document here.

MR. TAVENNER: That means that the copy given me was numbered differently and processed differently than the one that has been circulated in the Tribunal.

ACTING PRESIDENT: This is supposed to be defense document 2858.

MR. TAVENNER: The two documents are different. It would be rather hard for me to find it quickly, but that is the only indirect reference to OSHIMA in this document.

Here, I have found it; it is on page 7 of this document. The sentence next to the last of the first paragraph beginning on page 7. That is a point which is not disputed in this case; though other grounds and rulings of the Tribunal could probably be assigned for the rejection of this document, it is believed that it is sufficient to place the objection squarely upon the point that it does not involve the individual defense of this accused. Certainly if the document is to be admitted, that sentence, which is the only one naming this accused, should be admitted.

an agreement drawn up by the German Government, which was presumably agreed upon with the Japanese officials in Berlin." This is not a disputed passage.

ACTING PRESIDENT: We have no page 10 in our document here.

MR. TAVENNER: That means that the copy given me was numbered differently and processed differently than the one that has been circulated in the Tribunal.

ACTING PRESIDENT: This is supposed to be defense document 2858.

MR. TAVENNER: The two documents are different. It would be rather hard for me to find it quickly, but that is the only indirect reference to OSHIMA in this document.

Here, I have found it; it is on page 7 of this document. The sentence next to the last of the first paragraph beginning on page 7. That is a point which is not disputed in this case; though other grounds and rulings of the Tribunal could probably be assigned for the rejection of this document, it is believed that it is sufficient to place the objection squarely upon the point that it does not involve the individual defense of this accused. Certainly if the document is to be admitted, that sentence, which is the only one naming this accused, should be admitted.

ACTING PRESIDENT: What the Tribunal wants to know is that this statement having been made in November 1945, and interrogatories having been had since that time, why the contents of this statement were not included and covered by the interrogatories?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Your Honor, I will have to give you just a very brief history of that. At the time the interrogatories were taken we did not have this statement, did not know it existed, and it was discovered after the interrogatories were taken.

ACTING PRESIDENT: He didn't give it to the prosecution, did he?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yes, he gave the statement to the CIC in Peiping.

Now, I made an application for an order of the Tribunal for the prosecution to turn over to me the interrogation of Ambassador Ctt, and I obtained that interrogation, and in that interrogation, just a week or ten days ago, a reference was made to this statement.

Now, in the second place, the interrogations contain hundreds of pages and go into fine detail concerning the matters which are touched here briefly, and that is the reason I have selected this document instead of asking that the interrogations be processed which went into such fine detail.

this is a general statement, and if I had had the statement at the time the Tripartite negotiations were presented to this Tribunal, I would have introduced it then because it is of a more general nature, but con-

sidering the fact that Mr. OSHIMA is a little more

Now, I agree with Mr. Tavenner in this, that

vitally concerned in this statement and in the relations.
of Japan and Germany, I considered that this was the

next best appropriate time to present it.

Now, the third point is that if there had been any possibility of having the supboena honored and Ambassador Ott brought here personally, there would be no necessity for me to ask that this secondary evidence be introduced here, but this document does fill in a great many of the gaps which are left from the telegrams and intermingled communications of Ambassador Ott to his country.

Now, on the one reference that I make to the provision that it should be eliminated from the document, I wish to state that the reason we are not offering that sentence to the Tribunal is because it is not a statement of fact; it is far from the fact. I cannot make an offer of evidence, knowing that it is not a statement of the fact, and I know from the other evidence, or am satisfied in my mind that that statement is not a

1

5

6

8

7

10

11 12

13 14

15

16 17

18 19

20 21

22 23

24

25

Now, I agree with Mr. Tavenner in this, that this is a general statement, and if I had had the statement at the time the Tripartite negotiations were presented to this Tribunal, I would have introduced it then because it is of a more general nature, but considering the fact that Mr. OSHIMA is a little more vitally concerned in this statement and in the relations. of Japan and Germany, I considered that this was the next best appropriate time to present it.

Now, the third point is that if there had been any possibility of having the supboena honored and Ambassador Ott brought here personally, there would be no necessity for me to ask that this secondary evidence be introduced here, but this document does fill in a great many of the gaps which are left from the telegrams and intermingled communications of Ambassador Ott to his country.

Now, on the one reference that I make to the provision that it should be eliminated from the document, I wish to state that the reason we are not offering that sentence to the Tribunal is because it is not a statement of fact; it is far from the fact. I cannot make an offer of evidence, knowing that it is not a statement of the fact, and I know from the other evidence. or am satisfied in my mind that that statement is not a

statement of the fact; it is an opinion of fact, a surmise and an assumption on the part of the party who stated it, and therefore I do not wish to mislead the Tribunal on the matter.

And lastly, the document does not justify all this argument. If I had thought that we would have so much discussion about it, for what it is worth and the gaps that it fills in, it doesn't justify the time that we have spent arguing it, but I would like to have it accepted for what it is worth.

Now, one last remark ---

ACTING PRESIDENT: You just made the remark that we have wasted time arguing these procedural questions. The Court has felt for some time and has suggested that we are spending too much time upon objections upon points of evidence or the admission of documents.

By a majority the objection is sustained.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: The affidavit of Shinichi
TANAKA is now presented for the purpose of denial of
any participation on the part of OSHIMA in the
operational plans for the Pacific War. This is
defense document 2542 and I ask that the witness
TANAKA be called.

MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, as I do not propose to cross-examine this witness some time can be saved if he not be called.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Under those circumstances there is no necessity for calling him unless you have some further questions to ask.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: No, your Honor, I had no idea that he would not be called for cross-examination.

I offer defense document 2542, the affidavit of TANAKA.

ACTING PRESIDENT: It will be admitted.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2542

8

5

7

10

12

13

15

17

1.9

21

22

23

will receive exhibit No. 3504.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3504 and received in evidence.)

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I shall start to read the second paragraph, skipping the formal parts:

"I was from October 1940 until 7 December 1942 the Director of the First Division of the General Staff in charge of operational matters.

Tribunal that in the peace time operational plan of 1941 no concrete plans for attacking Hongkong, Singapore, etc. were included. Besides this peace time operational plan the Japanese Army made during the period between January and May 1941 no concrete plans or preparations for occupying Singapore, Hong-kong and the Philippines or one of these places. No study worth mentioning was even made.

"3. The General Staff received neither from Germany nor from Mr. OSHIMA directly or indirectly any suggestions or influences in drafting and deciding the operational plans or any one of them including the attacks on British Malay, Singapore, Hongkong, the Philippines, Netherlands East Indies and the Southern Regions. Nor was there any case that the

1 2

7 8

General Staff concerning these plans or any one of them asked directly or indirectly through Ambassador OSHIMA for opinion, suggestions or assistance from Germany. Also, Mr. OSHIMA never recommended to the 3 General Staff preparations or carrying out of these operational plans or any one of them." 6 Mr. SHIMANOUCHI will introduce the next 7 witness. 8 MR. SHIMANOUCHI: I call KOMATSU, Mitsuhiko 9 as my next witness. 10 MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, the 11 prosecution will not cross-examine this witness and 12 he need not be called as far as we are concerned. 13 ACTING PRESIDENT: Unless you have some fur-14 ther questions to ask outside the affidavit there is 15 no need for calling the witness. 16 MR. SHIMANOUCHI: As I have no additional .17 questions I shall not call the witness, your Honor. 18 I offer defense document 2783 in evidence. 19 ACTING PRESIDENT: It will be admitted. 20 CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2783 21 will receive exhibit No. 3505. 22 23 (Whereupon, the document above 24 referred to was marked defense exhibit 25 No. 3505 and received in evidence.) MR. SHIMANOUCHI: I shall read defense

document 2783 which is now Court exhibit 3505:

"I, KOMATSU, Mitsuhiko, state under oath as follows:

"1. My present address is No. 1086 Yanadamachi, Kami-gun, Kochi Prefecture.

the Assistant Military Attache and concurrently the Assisting member of the Tripartite Mixed Commission Japan-Germany-Italy in Berlin. I arrived in Berlin via Siteria together with Ambassador OSHIMA in February 1941. I was appointed the Military Attache and concurrently the member of the above mentioned Commission at the beginning of 1943 succeeding Lt. General BANZAI and stayed on my post until the end of the war. During the tour of my duty in Berlin I was at first Major General, and later Lt. General.

Commission in Berlin based on the Tripartite Lixed Ambassador OSHILA for the General, Lt. General BANZAI and Vice Admiral NOLURA for the Military and Linister LATSUSHILA for the Economic Commission. These commissions were never convened until the outbreak of the Pacific War. Even after its outbreak they net only two or three times, and were never convened after the beginning of 1943 when I became a member of the Mili-

7 8

tary Commission succeeding Lt. General BANZAI. I heard from Lt. General BANZAI that during the meetings there were only propagandistic reports on the past war situation by the German side.

"4. Shortly after the outbreak of the Pacific War, the Military Agreement between the three
countries of Japan, Germany, and Italy was concluded
in January 1942. This was a purely Military Agreement
concerning matters of the High Command. As far as I
know and heard from late Military Attache BANZAI,
Ambassador OSHIMA was in fact not at all connected
with this matter.

"5. Ambassador OSHIMA told and consulted the military and naval attaches and other higher Embassy officials whenever he received instructions from Tokyo or had talks with German leaders. He was often telling us that because very little information was received from the Japanese Government, it was regrettable that he could not know the policy of the Japanese Government, and that he could not talk serious matters with the German side as especially he did not know the future plan of Japan. What Ambassador OSHIMA thought most important on his arrival in Berlin was, as I heard from him, to find out what perspective or plan Germany had for the future of the European War,

- 25

and especially, whether and when she was in fact going to carry out landing operations against England and what preparations she was making.

"6. I heard from Ambassador OSHIMA that
Germany desired Japan to attack Singapore in the
spring of 1941, but I learned from him that on this
Singapore question he was only expressing his personal opinion on the basis of the military common sense
he acquired as an ex-soldier and he did not broach
this question on his own initiative. This Singapore
question was brought out only before the outbreak of
the German-Russian war, and thereafter Germany
changed her mind and asked Japan to attack Soviet
Russia, according to what I heard from Ambassador
OSHIMA.

"7. I was allowed to see important telegrams Ambassador OSHI...A sent to Tokyo prior to or after the dispatch. I never read a telegram by which Ambassador OSHI...A as his own opinion recommended such attacks to Tokyo.

"8. Very little information was received from Tokyo as mentioned above. We in Berlin, including Ambassador OSHIMA, received almost no communication concerning the Japanese-American negotiations and could not understand the situation in Japan well.

Ambassador OSHIMA expressed his opinion, even when he received the instructions to negotiate for the Non-Separate Peace Treaty immediately before the outbreak of the war; that war would not be opened between Japan and the United States. Such being the circumstances, I was very much surprised when I heard the attack on Pearl Harbor by foreign radio broadcast. Ambassador OSHIMA and all the others who gathered at the Embassy shortly thereafter expressed to each other their greatest surprise, also."

Signed "KOMATSU, Litsuhiko" "At Tokyo, 31 march 1947."

Mr. Cunningham will continue with the presentation of evidence.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham.

witness TATSUMI, I offer in evidence defense document 2662, his affidavit.

ACTING PRESIDENT: It will be admitted in evidence.

CLLRG OF THE COURT: Defense document 2662 will receive exhibit No. 3506.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3506 and received in evidence.)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

ACTING PRESIDENT: You will read the affidavi, after the recess.

We will recess for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1445, a recess was taken until 1500, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed. ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I now read exhibit 3506.

"I, TATSUMI, Eiichi, being first duly sworn on oath, do hereby depose and say:

"1. That my military career was outlined in my previous affidavits, offered in evidence in the DOHIHAKA case, and will not be repeated here. I was Military Attache to Great Britain in 1936 to 1938 and 1939 to 1942, and had been Assistant Military Attache from 1930 to 1933. I was returned to Japan by repatriation boat in September 1942 at the time when the British Embassy Staff were repatriated to 21 England in exchange. Mr. KAMIMURA was the Charge d'Affaires and head of the Embassy group at the time of our return, having succeeded Ambassador SHIGEMITSU, who returned in May or June, 1941, as head of the

12 13

14 15

25

mission.

"2. During my tour of duty as Assistant and . 1 as Military Attache in London I was responsible direct-2 ly to the Chief of the Imperial General Staff and was 3 only related to the ambassador in matters of confer-5 ence. Under the Japanese military system the military 6 attache is appointed, directed and supervised and re-7 moved by the military authorities and is not under 8 the authority of the ambassador to whom he is attached. 9 "3. One of the major factors in the appoint-10 ment of a military attache to a foreign government 11 is the language ability of the officer to be appointed. 12

ment of a military attache to a foreign government is the language ability of the officer to be appointed. In my case Ly language instruction was concentrated on English and my only foreign assignments were in London.

"4. At the time of the close of the Pacific
War I was a lieutenant general in the Japanese army.
"TATSUMI, Eiichi."

Now, Mr. SHIMANOUCHI will present the next witness.

MR. SHIMANOUCHI: I call YOKOI, Tadao, as our next witness.

23

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

7	TADAO YOKOI, called as a witness on behalf
2	of the defense, being first duly sworn, testified
3	through Japanese interpreters as follows:
4	DIRECT EXAMINATION
5	BY MR. SHIMANOUCHI:
6	Q What is your name and address, Witness?
7	A YOKOI, Tadao, 2327 Midori-ga-oka, Meguro-ku,
8	Tokyo.
9	MR. SHIMANOUCHI: May the witness be shown
10	defense document No. 2671?
11	(Whereupon, a document was handed to the
12	witness.)
13	Q Is that your affidavit?
14	A Yes.
15	Q Are the contents thereof true and correct?
16	A Yes.
17	MR. SHIMANOUCHI: I offer in evidence defense
	document 2761.
19	ACTING PRESIDENT: It will be admitted in
20	evidence.
21	CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2761 will
	receive exhibit No. 3507.
24	(Whereupon, the document above
25	referred to was marked defense exhibit
	No. 3507 and received in evidence.)
-	

MR. SHIMANOUCHI: I read court exhibit 3507, omitting the formal parts.

Naval Attache to the Japanese Embassy in Germany and

went to Berlin via Siberia. At that time I was a

captain in the navy. I was promoted in November 1940

"l. I was appointed in September 1940

3 4

2

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13 14

15

16

18

20

21 22

23

17 19 to rear admiral and stayed in Berlin until October 1943 when I left for Japan. "2. In or about February or March 1943 Vice Admiral NOMURA and I learned from Ambassador OSHIMA of an offer of Hitler to transfer two submarines to Japan for the purpose of a study by the Japanese navy. Ambassador OSHIMA told us that no conditions were attached to this offer. Thereafter, a telegraphic instruction was received by Vice Admiral NOMURA from the central naval authorities in Toryo to the effect that the Japanese navy was very much pleased to accept this offer. Ambassador OSHIMA, upon our request, saw Foreign Minister Ribbentrop and conveyed this acceptance by the Japanese navy, and we understood that no special conditions were attached by the German side also on this occasion. The practical procedure of transfer was thereafter completed between the Japanese and the German navies, and during these negotiations also no

strings were attached to the matter.

8 9

10

11 12

13 14

15 16

17

19 20

18

21 22

23

25

In connection with this transfer of 113. submarines I never heard from Ambassador OSHIMA, nor from the German side or anybody else about attacking or annihilating crews of torpedoed merchant ships.

"I might add that I never heard from Ambassador OSHIMA, nor from anybody else, that Germany adopted the policy of attacking or annihilating crews of merchant ships torpedoed by submarines.

"YCKOI, Tadao."

I forgot to state that in the fourth line of paragraph 1, November 1940 should read November 1942. This is a typographical error in the English text, and the Japanese original states 1942.

With the permission of the Tribunal, I should like to conduct a few additional direct examination.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Froceed.

About the end of November 1941, or about the beginning of December of the same year, was OSHIMA in Berlin or was he in some other place?

Towards the end of November Ambassador OSHIMA left Berlin for Vienna, together with other members of the embassy, to attend the Mozart Festival.

Mr. SHIMANOUCHI: I have no other question in direct. The prosecution may cross-examine the witness. ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

****	***	. מקוחותותוזו m
HY	MR.	TAVENNER:

relating to the delivery of the two German submarines
to Japan were you, as a naval military attache, a
member of the joint military commission in Berlin
established under the provisions of the Tripartite Pact?

/ Yes.

Q Vice Admiral NOMURA, who was also a member of the commission, and you arranged the details for the transfer of the two submarines, is that not true?

A We consulted with the German Navy in regard to the details.

Q Did this military commission frequently discuss formally or informally the problems relating to the transfer of the submarines and other military matters?

A This matter was not settled by the military commission.

Q But the two of you who were on the military commission did confer regarding the matter?

NCMURA consulted on this matter in his capacity as the highest naval representative in Borlin and I in my capacity as naval attache.

10

11

13

14 15

16 17

18.

19

20 21

22 23

24

25

You and Idmiral NOMURA who were members of this 0 commission, did you meet frequently and discuss military metters as a commission?

No, we did not consult on military matters.

Vell, certainly military matters must have been discussed between the two participating powers under the Tripartite Pact. Do you mean to say that the commission, military commission, established for the purpose of discussing military matters did not meet and discuss them?

MR. SHIMANOUCHI: I object to this question on the ground that this, the present affidavit, does not contain enything in connection with the Tripartite Pact. Accordingly the question of the prosecutor is outside the scope of the affidavit.

> ACTING PRESIDINT: Objection overruled. MR. TAVENNER: Please answer the question.

That may have been the purpose of the mixed commission but what I am telling you is that actually no such discussions were held.

Now, do you meen your commission did not discuss military matters?

I have no recollection of ever having discussed military matters -- I have no recollection that it ever discussed --

Q Well, why was it that your military commission established under the Tripartite Pact did not discuss military matters?

A I don't know the reason.

Q Let me see if I can refresh your recollection.

Did not your military commission fail to function because as a matter of fact an informal commission composed of Ribbentrop and OSHIMA took over the functions of your committee and military matters were thus settled in the main on a higher level? Isn't that true?

A No, that isn't true.

Q Do you not recall appearing at room 618, Meiji Building, on the 25th day of March 1946, at which time you were interrogated by Lieutenant F. E. Kennamer, Jr., and Lieutenant A. E. Klauser served as interpreter, at which time you told Lieutenant Kennamer in substance as follows: "Another reason that the joint military commission did not function effectively was that an unofficial commission which consisted of Foreign Minister Ribbentrop and General OSHIMA, the Japanese ambassador to Germany, was established. Ribbentrop and OSHIMA conferred in respect to military measures and with these conferences proceeding on the level of the German Foreign Office it was difficult for the subordinate military commission to carry out its functions."

YOKOI

.17

Did you or did you not make that statement?		
A I think I said something to that effect.		
Q In Merch 1934 did not Ribbentrop request		
OSHIMA to communicate to the Japanese Government the		
German desire that submarine worfare in the Indian		
Ocean be intensified?		
A I did not hear that he had demanded that of		
the government but I did hear that he had expressed		
such desires to the government.		
MR. TAVENNER: No further questions, if the		
Tribunal please.		
MR. SHIMANOUCHI: No redirect. May the witness		
be released on the usual terms?		
ACTING PRESIDENT: He will be so released.		
("hereupon, the witness was excused.)		
MR. SHIMANOUCHI, Mr. Cunningham will continue		
with the presentation of the defense.		
MR. CUNNINGHAM: We now call to the witness		
stand the accused OSHIMA, Hiroshi, who will testify		
through defense document 2862.		
Contract of the last two last to the last two la		

22

24

	HIROSHI OSHIMA, an accused, being first
1	duly sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters
2	as follows:
3	DIRECT EXAMINATION
4	BY MR. CUNNINGHAM:
5	Q I ask that you state your name.
6	A OSHIMA, Hiroshi.
7	MR. CUNNINCHAM: I ask that the witness be
8	shown defense document 2862.
9	(Whereupon, a document was handed
0	to the witness.)
1	Q You have been handed defense document 2862.
2	I ask if that is your affidavit.
.3	A This is my affidavit.
4	and the statements contained therein
5	
6	true?
7	A They are all true. MR. CUNNINGHAM: I offer in evidence defense
8	
9	document 2862.
20	ACTING PRESIDENT: It will be admitted in
21	evidence.
22	CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2862 w111
3	receive exhibit No. 3508.
4	(Whereupon, the document above referred
5	to was marked defense exhibit No. 3508 and re-
1	ceived in evidence.)

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

OSHIMA

Duda & Reicher

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I will read in evidence exhibit 3508, the affidavit of OSHIMA, Hiroshi:
"1. MY MILITARY CAREER.

"I was born in 1886. I entered the Military Preparatory School at the age of thirteen, and, after graduating from the Military Academy, was appointed in 1906 2d Lieutenant of the artillery branch of the army.

"In 1921 while I was a Captain I was appointed Assistant Military Attache and went to Berlin. After my return home in 1925 I was successively a battalion and regimental commander, an instructor of the Army Heavy Artillery School, and a member of the Inspectorate-General of Military Training of the Army. During this period I was mostly concerned with educational matters. From August 1931 until the spring of 1934 I was Chief of the Third Section of the General Staff with the rank of Colonel, and was in charge of internal defense matters including the fortifications and the anti-aircraft defense. I was then appointed Military Attache of the Japanese Embassy in Berlin. Having been appointed Ambassador to Germany, I resigned my commission and left the army in October 1938. I was then a Lieutenant General.

"While I was in the army I never belonged

to any clique, though I do not know if there was any such thing in existence.

"2. MY RELATIONS WITH GERMANY.

time to Germany as an Assistant Military Attache, and stayed in Berlin until February 1923, when I was appointed Military Attache in Vienna, Austria. Germany at that time was in the middle of depression and confusion after her defeat, and I got an unfavorable impression politically, economically, and militarily of the country.

"When I went back to Berlin in May 1934 as
the Military Attache of the Embassy, just one and
half years after Hitler had come to power, I found
that everything in Germany had changed and had
considerably improved, compared to the time of my
last sojourn. I felt that there were things in the
new Germany which were worthy of serious consideration.

"As Military Attache it was my duty to gather information and make reports to the General Staff in Tokyo concerning military matters, and in the discharge of that duty I naturally came in contact with leading members of the German army and air force.

With the exception of Ribbentrop, with whom I became acquainted through the preliminary contact for the

OSHIMA

Anti-Comintern Pact, my contact was generally with German military leaders, among whom may be mentioned General Fritsch, well known for his anti-Nazi tendency, and General Beck and Admiral Canaris, who were both executed on account of their participation in the affair of July 20, 1944.

"2) During my two tours as Ambassador, I found that the bulk of my time and energy had to be devoted to matters such as culture, trade, protection of the Japanese nationals, etc., purely diplomatic contact with the German Government being only a small fraction of the business of the Embassy. My direct approach to the German Government was naturally through Foreign Minister Ribbentrop. But Ribbentrop was very often absent from Berlin, especially after the war had begun because he had to stay with Hitler in the German General Headquarters, and the location of the headquarters changed from time to time. I met Ribbentrop no more than five or six times a year. I met Hitler usually only upon his request, and that was possibly two or three times a year.

"With Nazi leaders other than Hitler and Ribbentrop, I met only on ceremonial occasions or at social parties, and had no official relations with

10

12

14

16

17

20

21

440

23

8

11

10

12 13

14 15

16

17 18

20 21

22

23 24

25

The German Foreign Office extremely disthem. liked the foreign ambassadors and ministers making direct contacts with German leaders other than the Foreign Minister, or with branches of the government other than the Foreign Ministry. Ribbentrop having made his wishes in the matter quite clear to me, I was careful not to go over his head or that of his ministry.

"3) There was the Anti-Comintern Pact in existence during my first ambassadorship, and the Tripartite Pact was already in effect prior to my second sojourn in Berlin. As the Japanese Ambassador to Germany I felt in duty bound to concentrate my endeavors on the maintenance and improvement of Japanese-German relations in the spirit of these agreements. I did my best to live up to this conviction, always acting in line of the policy of the home government then in power. For that purpose, I tried to maintain as close a relationship as possible with Hitler, Ribbentrop and others who happened to be the German leaders, in order to make myself an effective channel for smooth exchange of views between Japan and Germany. I never approved the Nazi ideology or policy as a whole. Particularly I had no sympathy with the race theory of the Nazis, their

them. The German Foreign Office extremely disliked the foreign ambassadors and ministers making
direct contacts with German leaders other than the
Foreign Minister, or with branches of the government other than the Foreign Ministry. Ribbentrop
having made his wishes in the matter quite clear to
me, I was careful not to go over his head or that of
his ministry.

8

10

22

23

24

25

"3) There was the Anti-Comintern Pact in existence during my first ambassadorship, and the Tripartite Pact was already in effect prior to my second sojourn in Berlin. As the Japanese Ambassador to Germany I felt in duty bound to concentrate my endeavors on the maintenance and improvement of Japanese-German relations in the spirit of these agreements. I did my best to live up to this conviction, always acting in line of the policy of the home government then in power. For that purpose, I tried to maintain as close a relationship as possible with Hitler, Ribbentrop and others who happened to be the German leaders, in order to make myself an effective channel for smooth exchange of views between Japan and Germany. I never approved the Nazi ideology or policy as a whole. Particularly I had no sympathy with the race theory of the Nazis, their

anti-Jewish and anti-Christian policy. I also disapproved of their method of administration in the territories occupied during the war. Diplomatic decorum and discretion prevented me from expressing my views openly, but I think that they were sufficiently understood by the Japanese and Germans with whom I had dealings.

Japan and Germany the Japanese-German Cultural
Agreement was concluded in 1938. Works of German
philosophy, natural science and music were extensively
imported to Japan for many years prior to my time.
I thought that the exchange of culture between Japan
and Germany would benefit both nations, although I
did not agree with many features of the cultural
policy of the National Socialist Party. I supported
the enterprises of the Japanese-German Cultural
Society, and attended as often as possible cultural
gatherings in various places in Germany; a considerable part of my time as ambassador was occupied with
these enterprises.

anti-Jewish and anti-Christian policy. I also disapproved of their method of administration in the territories occupied during the war. Diplomatic decorum and discretion prevented me from expressing my views openly, but I think that they were sufficiently understood by the Japanese and Germans with whom I had dealings.

Japan and Germany the Japanese-German Cultural
Agreement was concluded in 1938. Works of German
philosophy, natural science and music were extensively
imported to Japan for many years prior to my time.
I thought that the exchange of culture between Japan
and Germany would benefit both nations, although I
did not agree with many features of the cultural
policy of the National Socialist Party. I supported
the enterprises of the Japanese-German Cultural
Society, and attended as often as possible cultural
gatherings in various places in Germany; a considerable part of my time as ambassador was occupied with
these enterprises.

33,980

"3. CONCERNING THE DOCUMENTS TENDERED BY THE PROSECUTION AS EVIDENCE.

my interrogations. These were conducted and recorded in English. As I practically have no knowledge of the English language and was entirely dependent upon interpreters, it was inevitable that some difficulties of understanding each other or some misunderstandings or misinterpretations occurred. This I found out later. Some of the more important examples thereof will be pointed out later.

- "2) Next I should like to state concerning the German documents as follows:
- documents concerning my conversations with Hitler,
 Ribbentrop and other Germans. These conversations were
 conducted always in German, of course without interpreter. At my conversations with Hitler, Ribbentrop
 was always present. Stahmer or his successor was sometimes present at my interviews with Ribbentrop. There
 was, however, no stenographer or recorder present. The
 records of those conversations must have been made
 afterwards from memory, some of them even several days
 after the conversations. Therefore, they cannot always
 be accurate.

"With respect to the documents concerning my conversation with Ribbentrop I find that they were 2 generally compiled in a one-sided vein favourable for 3 Ribbentrop. Sometimes it is even stated that I agreed with him on certain matters while actually these matters were only talked about in the course of our conversations and I expressed no opinion thereon. I think this s was because Ribbentrop had many enemies in the German Government as well as within the German military circles, and in distributing these documents to such people he had to resort to this sort of internal-political maneuvering in order to show the success of the pro-Japanese policy initiated by him. Concrete examples 14 will be given later.

"b) I knew well that it was only Hitler and
Ribbentrop who decided the German foreign policy, and
that it was therefore of no use to talk to their subordinates. I always talked over important matters either
directly with them or through the liaison man, Stahmer
or his successor, in case Ribbentrop was absent from
Berlin. I met very seldom other officials of the
German Foreign Office except on social occasions. I
talked over routine matters with them, but rarely.

"In the records prepared by such people as Weizsaecker, Erdmannsdorf, etc., on my conversations

?

21

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

with them, which are now in exhibit in this trial, there are many matters of which I have no recollection. They evidently drafted these documents, adding much to my informal chats and putting them in such a form as to make it appear as if they had important talks with me, and then presented them to Ribbentrop. I find several matters in these documents of which they must have obtained information from other sources.

"c) Many telegrams or reports signed by Ambassador Ott were tendered, some of them referring to me.

"I first made acquaintance of Ott in April 1934, prior to my going to Germany as Military Attache, when Ott arrived in Tokyo as the Military Attache of the German Embassy. Ott paid me a courtesy visit at that time. Thereafter, we were separated because I was in Berlin while he was in Tokyo. I had a personal contact with him during my stay in Tokyo between Lecember 1939 and January 1941, when I left Japan for my second ambassadorial tour of duty. We had sometimes informal chats about matters concerning Japan and Germany. I never considered them seriously as I was completely retired from the public life at that time, did not know the view of the government, and also had no inside information to give. I am much surprised that

9 10

. 1

3

5

7

8

11 12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

OSHIMA

my name was often cited in the telegrams of Ambassador Ott.

"I was from August 1931 until March 1934 the

"4. MANCHURIAN INCIDENT.

3

5

Chief of the Third Section of the General Staff. As my post was in charge of such purely internal defense

Berlin in March 1934.

6

matters as the fortifications and the anti-aircraft

8

defense, I had no connection with the Manchurian Incident or with the problem of Manchukuo. This situation

10

continued also after I became the Military Attache in

Attache of the Japanese Embassy in Germany and arrived

in Berlin in May of the year. As to the circumstances

of my appointment I heard that I was chosen because I

spoke the German language well and had some knowledge

11

"5. MY APPOINTMENT TO MILITARY ATTACHE.

"1) In March 1934 I was appointed Military

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

24

25

of Germany as a result of my previous stay in that country. The Chief of the General Staff at the time of my appointment was Prince KAN-IN, and General UEDA, Kenkichi, was the Deputy Chief of the General Staff.

"Prior to my departure from Tokyo I received orally through General UEDA instructions of the Chief of the General Staff concerning my cuty in Germany. I was ordered to watch and investigate, among other things,

the stability of the Nazi regime, the future of the German army, relations between Germany and Russia, and particularly between the armies of the two countries. I was further instructed to collect information and report on Soviet Russia.

"2) According to the Japanese system the Military Attache belonged directly under the Chief of the General Staff, and was not subordinate to the Ambassador (defense document No. 2855)" which I now offer in evidence. I will read the document after I complete the statement.

ACTING PRESIDENT: It will be admitted in evidence.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2855 will receive exhibit No. 3509.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3509 and received in evidence.)

MR. CUNNINGHAM: (Continuing) "He carried out his duties solely in accordance with instructions of the Chief of the General Staff, and reported or sent information directly to him instead of going through the Ambassador.

"6. ANTI-COMINTERN PACT.

"1) Concerning my contacts with Ribbentrop

prior to the negotiations for the Anti-Comintern Pact which was concluded between Japan and Germany in 1936 the prosecution offered parts of my interrogation as exhibits 477 and 478, transcript pages 5913-5916 and 5917-5918. I should like to point out regarding this matter that the contacts I had with Ribbentrop and Hack as narrated here were for the sole purpose of collecting information. This was one of my main duties as Military Attache. They were nothing in the nature of diplomatic negotiations. When I met him in 1935, Ribbentrop had the title of Ambassador unattached. Hack was a salesbroker of arms for foreign countries who had been visiting the office of the Japanese Military Attache in Berlin long before my arrival.

"2a) In exhibit 478, transcript pages 59175918, it is made to appear that, in answer to the question 'Are they (the Japanese Military and Naval Attaches) authorized by virtue of their position as military attache to enter into negotiations with the military of another nation, looking towards a pact or a treaty or an international agreement between the two nations?' I stated: 'Yes, if it was a strictly military matter they may discuss these matters without going through the Ambassador.' I should like to state the following in order to clarify this point:

V

"The Japanese Military (or Naval) Attache is authorized to negotiate for and conclude purely military agreements with the military of the country of his residence. In this case, no participation of the Ambassedor is tolerated, according to the Japanese system of law. As to other matters, the Military Attache can only send information to the General Staff, but is not authorized to negotiate with the government of the country of his residence.

"b) In the same exhibit 478 it is made to appear also that I stated that 'that is quite true that the army had enough power to very probably sell the pact to the Japanese Government,' and that 'I would say that no treaty could possibly have been made on this if the army had not wished it.' But I have no recollection of stating such things. I only said as to the reason why Ribbentrop approached me, the Military Attache, that he might have thought that the Japanese army was most interested for such a matter in view of the general situation at the time. This statement must have been misunderstood.

"3) After I had reported on the desire of
Ribbentrop to the General Staff in Tokyo, Lieutenant
Colonel WAKAMATSU was dispatched to find out the views
of the German Government and the German army firsthand.

-

He arrived in Berlin at the end of November 1935.

I took him to Ribbentrop and General Blomberg, German Minister of Defense. In this interview Ribbentrop proposed conclusion of an Anti-Comintern Pact, on the ground that the Seventh Congress of the Communist International in Moscow of that year brought out a resolution to the effect that Japan and Germany were its primary enemies, and that Japan and Germany had common interests to defend themselves against destructive activities of the Comintern. I expressed no opinion to this proposal. Lieutenant Colonel WAKAMATSU left Berlin with this information in December 1935, and arrived in Tokyo at the end of January 1936.

on leave in Tokyo. He returned to Berlin at the end of April 1936, after the main points in this matter had been decided upon in Tokyo. Thereafter, negotiations were conducted by MUSHAKOJI with Ribbentrop in accordance with instructions of the government, and the Anti-Comintern Pact and the Secret Agreement with Germany were concluded.

"5a) Concerning the purpose of the Japanese Government in concluding the Anti-Comintern Pact and the Secret Agreement with Germany my understanding was as follows:

)

n

8 9

"First: Inasmuch as Japan was internationally isolated after the Manchurian Incident, it was desirable to remove that uneasy feeling by finding some ally or allies;

"Secondly: Since the destructive activities of the Comintern were rampant in Europe and in Asia at the time, eating into the internal structure of nations as seen in the Spanish civil war and the communist rebellion in China, it was felt advisable that as many nations as possible should join hands and take countermeasures; this was especially necessary for Japan in view of the resolution of the Seventh Congress of the Comintern in Moscow in 1935 which declared Japan and Germany as its primary enemies; and

"Thirdly: Japan was keenly feeling pressure from Soviet Russia at the time. Russia had developed her heavy industries by the Five-Year Plan and had increased her armament to a great extent. She had considerably reinforced her army in the Far East.

"Therefore, Japan wanted to come to a political agreement wit. Germany Thich was similarly situated vis-a-vis Soviet Russia, in order thus to make her position more secure against the Russian pressure.

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

With this purpose of the Pact as under-

stood by me I was in complete agreement.

"b) The prosecution alleges that the Anti-Comintern Pact and the Secret Agreement were the forerunners of the Tripartite Pact of September 1940; that they were aggressive agreements directed against the whole democratic countries and were particularly used in the aggression against China. I never heard that the Japanese Government and the army ever had such thoughts in connection with the conclusion of these agreements, nor had I such thoughts myself. I believed that the Anti-Comintern Pact was an ideological pact against the spread of communism, and the Secret Agreement was of a very passive nature only stipulating as it does that Jacan or Germany would not carry out any measures which would, in their effect, be apt to relieve the position of Soviet Russia in case one of the two countries was attacked by her unprovokedly. The text clearly shows this. I also did not dream of the outbreak of the China Incident at the time of the conclusion of these agreements.

23

22

24

"8. HIMLLER'S MELORANDUM.

memorandum, transcript pages 6,026-6,028, says that
Himmler visited me on 31 January 1939 and talked
with me concerning counter-intelligence activities
against Soviet Russia. But Himmler never visited me
at that time. I cannot remember seeing him then,
however hard I try to refresh my memory.

"During my ten years' stay in Germany, I

The prosecution exhibit 489, Himmler's

"During my ten years' stay in Germany, I had no special relations with Himmler either privately or officially. Only twice I received visits from him; namely, in the winter of 1936, when an official of the Japanese Home Office came to Germany in order to study measures for controlling communism, and I invited Himmler to a dinner party to solicit his assistance. This was done on behalf of this Japanese official. The other occasion was in March 1941, when I went to Germany as Ambassador for the second time, and Himmler visited me to return my courtesy call.

"Concerning the matters enumerated in this memorandum of Himmler I should like to explain as follows:

"2). In or about June 1937 while I was the Military Attache my office in Berlin began, in accordance with instructions of the Chief of the General

"7. CHINA INCIDENT.

"The outbreak of the China Incident in
July 1937 was a complete surprise to me. I had been
in Berlin as Military Attache since the Spring of
1934 and was completely out of touch with the China
problem. I learned by telegrams from the General
Staff after the outbreak of the incident of the
non-aggravation and non-extension policy of the
Japanese Government and the central army authorities,
and believed that it would soon be settled locally.

"It became gradually clear that it would not be settled quickly, and I was much concerned that the position of Japan would be endangered in the face of the Soviet armement in the Far East. At the end of December 1937 I received an instruction from the General Staff to request the German army that peace be offered to Chiang-Kai-Shek through General Falkenhausen who was in China as the military advisor to the Chinese Government. I approached the German army at once. General Keitel, Chief of OKW, agreed, and he initiated some action to that end. This attempt at peace did not materialize and had to be abandoned when the efforts of mediation by Ambassador Trautmann were terminated.

9.

3

4

6

7

9

10

11

13

14

15

17

18

19

22

23

24

25

Staff, to study the question of using White Russians in Berlin in order to collect information about Soviet Russia, and for propaganda and counter-intelligence purposes in case of war between Japan and Russia. This task was entrusted to Lt. Col. USUI, and after him to Col. MANAKI, of my staff. They were experts on Russian matters. In its very nature it was a fairly special service. Their office was separated from mine, the expenditure account was also separated, and in the General Staff Office in Tokyo, the section in charge of this service was different from the section which handled general matters concerning Military Attaches. My function was only to supervise rather than to direct it, although, since I received reports on more important matters, the final responsibility for the service rested with me. instructions of the Chief of the General Staff concerning the counter-intelligence were to the effect that this matter was only to be studied in consideration of war time, and not in any way to be executed in peace time.

"There was an understanding between the armies of Japan and Germany to collaborate concerning this matter. On the German side it was exclusively handled by the counter-intelligence section of the

OSHIMA

3

4 5

6

6 9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

Staff, to study the question of using White Russians in Berlin in order to collect information about Soviet Russia, and for propaganda and counter-intelligence purposes in case of war between Japan and Russia. This task was entrusted to Lt. Col. USUI, and after him to Col. MANAKI, of my staff. They were experts on Russian matters. In its very nature it was a fairly special service. Their office was separated from mine, the expenditure account was also separated, and in the General Staff Office in Tokyo, the section in charge of this service was different from the section which handled general matters concerning Military Attaches. My function was only to supervise rather than to direct it, although, since I received reports on more important matters, the final responsibility for the service rested with me. instructions of the Chief of the General Staff concerning the counter-intelligence were to the effect that this matter was only to be studied in consideration of war time, and not in any way to be executed in peace time.

"There was an understanding between the armies of Japan and Germany to collaborate concerning this matter. On the German side it was exclusively handled by the counter-intelligence section of the

·D

Defense Ministry whose chief was Navy Captain (later Admiral) Canaris, and, as I heard at the time, was kept strictly secret even within the Ministry itself.

"Himmler was not concerned with counterintelligence service. He and Canaris were on extremely
bad terms. Therefore, neither I, nor other Japanese
officers ever talked with Himmler or his subordinates
about this matter. I heard that Canaris was strangled
to death by wire by Himmler's subordinates in the last
stage of this war.

"I never concerned myself with the counterintelligence business after I became Ambassador.

- that he bought some real estate at Falkensee in the suburb of Berlin and kept there White Russians who were engaged in a small-scale printing of anti-Soviet pamphlets, but I knew nothing more than that. I myself never visited the place.
- "4) I never knew, nor heard, the story of sending anti-Russian pamphlets into Soviet Russia by belloons from Poland. In order to carry out such a program, it would have been necessary to secure collaboration of the Polish Government, but I never heard that such talks were conducted between Japan and Poland,

nor thought that the Japanese-Polish relations at that time were so cordial as to render possible such collaboration.

of the story of buying motor-boats in order to send pamphlets into Crimea from Roumania across the Black Sea. I never thought it possible to cross the Black Sea in motor-boats. In order to carry out this, collaboration of the Roumanian authorities would have been necessary. I did not think that the Japanese-Roumanian relations were so cordial as to permit such talks.

with bombs into Soviet Russia in order to assassinate Stalin, I could not even think of it. Such a contention is most fantastic and ridiculous. I could never have thought of such scheme as of sending ten people with bombs into Soviet Russia, as they would surely have been arrested, the plot discovered, and the result would have been most grave and destructive of the Japanese-Russian relations."

Do you wish to stop there, Sir?

ACTING PRESIDENT: We shall now adjourn until
9:30 tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 1600, an adjournment was taken until Wednesday, 26 November 1947, at 0930.)